

esk
New Series

Volume IX, Number 35

August 1958

The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

SEP 4 1958

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Editors

PETER ALEXANDER
NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor

JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

- Riddles 22 and 58 of the Exeter Book. By L. Blakeley . . . 241
The 'Impure Art' of John Webster. By Inga-Stina Ekeblad . . . 253
Verse and its Feet. By M. Whiteley 268

NOTES

- 'Lefunge o Swefne' o Nore' (J. A. W. Bennett). 280
Chapman's Use of North's Plutarch in *Caesar and Pompey*
(Peter Ure) 281
Further Thoughts on Religion: Swift's Relationship to Filmer
and Locke (Myrddin Jones) 284
Matthew Arnold's 'Stagirius' and Saint-Marc Girardin
(Kenneth Allott) 286

CORRESPONDENCE

- The Sermons of John Donne* (Evelyn M. Simpson) . . . 292
Daniel's *Cleopatra* and the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonius*
(Joan Rees) 294
Letters of William Blake (H. M. Margoliouth) . . . 295

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR WALTER GREG; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.

The Development of Germanic Verse Form, by Winfred P. Lehmann, 296; The Golden Mirror. Studies in Chaucer's Descriptive Technique and its Literary Background, by Claes Schaar, 297; The Thought and Culture of the English Renaissance: an Anthology of Tudor Prose 1481-1555, edited by Elizabeth M. Nugent, 300; English Pronunciation 1500-1700, by E. J. Dobson, 303; *Pericles*, edited by J. C. Maxwell (The New Shakespeare), 313; Shakespeare's Sources. Vol. I, Comedies and Tragedies, by Kenneth Muir, 314; Shakespeare and the Natural Condition, by Geoffrey Bush, 316; Shakespeare Survey 9, edited by Allardyce Nicoll, 318; Poems of Mr. John Milton. The 1645 edition with Essays in Analysis by Cleanth Brooks and John Edward Hardy, 319; Counterpoint and Symbol. An Inquiry into the Rhythm of Milton's Epic Style, by James Whaler, 320; Milton and Science, by Kester Svendsen, 322; Joseph Glanvill, Anglican Apologist, by Jackson I. Cope, 324; The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer, edited by Curt A. Zimansky, 325; The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements (1686-1719) with some aspects of Book Trade Practice, by Norma Hodgson and Cyprian Blagden (Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, N.S. 6), 327; Wordsworth's Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, edited by W. J. B. Owen, 329; The Italian Journal of Samuel Rogers, edited by J. R. Hale, 330; Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens: A Friendship and its Dissolution, by Elias Bredsdorff, 331; The Mind and Art of Coventry Patmore, by J. C. Reid, 332; Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins including his Correspondence with Coventry Patmore, edited by Claude Colleer Abbott, 2nd edition, 334; The Academy, 1869-1879. Victorian Intellectuals in Revolt, by Diderik Roll-Hansen, 336; The Man in the Name. Essays in the Experience of Poetry, by Leonard Unger, 338; Studies in Bibliography, Vol. IX, edited by Fredson Bowers, 340; Short Notices, 342; Summary of Periodical Literature, 349.

RIDDLES 22 AND 58 OF THE EXETER BOOK

By L. BLAKELEY

Riddle 22: The Circling Stars

I GIVE the text and translation of this riddle from the edition by W. S. Mackie:¹

- Ætsomne cwom .lx. monna
to wægstæpe wicgum ridan
hæfdon .xi. eoredmæcgas
friðhengestas .iiii. sceamas
5 ne meahton magorincas ofer mere feolan
swa hi fundedon ac wæs flod to deop
atol yþa geþræc ofras hea
streamas stronge ongunnon stigan þa
on wægn weras *ond* hyra wicg somod
10 hlodan under hrunge þa þa hors oðbær
eh *ond* eorlas æscum dealle
ofer wætres byht wægn to lande
swa hine oxa ne teah ne esna mægen
ne fæthengest ne on flode swom
15 ne be grunde wod gestum under
ne lagu drefde ne of lyfte fleag
ne under bæc cyrde brohte hwæpre
beornas ofer burnan *ond* hyra bloncan mid
from stæðe heaum þæt hy stopan up
20 on operne ellenrofe
weras of wæge *ond* hyra wicg gesund.

4. *MS.* frid hengestas

17. *MS.* neon der

Sixty men, riding on horses,
together came to the sea-shore.
The horsemen had eleven
horses of peace, four of them white horses.
The warriors could not force a way over the sea
as they had intended; but the flood was too deep,
fierce the crash of the waves, high the banks,
strong the currents. Then the men began
to climb into a wagon, and under its pole
they also loaded their horses; then the wagon carried
both the horses and the men, proud of their spears,
over the bight of the sea to the land;

¹ *The Exeter Book, Part II* (E.E.T.S. 194, 1934), pp. 112-13.

yet so that an ox did not draw it, nor did strong servants,
 nor did a draught-horse; nor did it float on the flood,
 nor move over the ground with its freight,
 nor churn up the sea, nor fly from the air,
 nor turn back. Nevertheless it carried
 the men over the water from the high shore
 and their white steeds with them, so that the warriors
 and their horses disembarked from the sea
 safe and sound upon the other side.

Since Dietrich's treatment of the riddle in 1859,¹ almost all commentators have agreed that the solution must be either 'Month' or 'December'. Dietrich took the sixty horsemen to be the half-days of the month, which pass over to the other bank of the next month. He found the eleven horses to be more difficult, but supposed it very probable that a month is thought of which contains, in addition to four Sundays, seven feast days. Only December is such a month; on this assumption the other bank is the following year.

There are, however, formidable objections to such a solution. Although its chief recommendation is that it seems to explain the numbers, it does not in reality do so. Thus the most recent editors note: 'This explanation seems a bit far-fetched; for one thing, if we count the days of the month by half-days, we would expect the other numbers to be doubled also.'² A feast day is represented by two horsemen and one horse! Moreover, even accepting the possibility of this, other objections arise: there ought to be sixty-two horsemen; there will often be five Sundays in December, instead of four; one or more feast days will often fall on a Sunday. The numbers, then, on which the whole theory is based, do not really support it. Dietrich reached his solution because of a similarity between the OE. riddle and two by Reinmar von Zweter,³ written centuries later, on the Year, with Months, Weeks, Days, and Nights. But the similarity is not very close, for the riddles of Reinmar contain, instead of the unique numbers of the OE. riddle, the unmistakable series characteristic of the members of a world-wide group of riddles—twelve wheels on the wagon, fifty-two women carried, seven white and seven black horses to pull it. The resemblance, therefore, is found only in the use of the image of a wagon, and is far too weak to justify the theory that the riddles are related.⁴

¹ 'Die Rätsel des Exeterbuchs', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, xi (1859), 466.

² G. P. Krapp and E. V. K. Dobbie, *The Exeter Book* (New York, 1936), p. 333.

³ G. Roethe, *Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter* (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 503-4.

⁴ It is a mistake to rely too much on the finding of analogues to give a solution. Thus, for example, in Riddle 13, Dietrich suggests '22 letters of the alphabet', Tupper '10 fingers and thumbs', Trautmann '10 chickens'. Each scholar produces analogues which seem perfectly satisfactory to him.

Perceiving the inadequacy of Dietrich's solution, Trautmann wished to ignore the numbers completely and to solve the riddle as 'bridge'.¹ But this solution does not satisfy the conditions.

I suggest that the wagon we are looking for—the mysterious wagon which moves without being pulled by anything, but which does not move on the water, or on the land, or fly from the air, or turn back—is, in fact, the best-known constellation in the sky: the Plough, or Charles's Wain. The poet has used the word *wægn* (ll. 9, 12), with its basic meaning of 'wagon' and its applied sense of 'Wain', to give a clue to the solution, which would seem therefore much easier to the Anglo-Saxon listener than it does to us. *Wægn* has the meaning 'Wain' in Alfred's *Boethius*: 'Swa swa tunglu habbað þe we hatað wænes ðisla'.² It is so used also by Ælfric, in his *De Temporibus Anni*, in a passage ultimately dependent on Isidore:

Arcton hatte an tungel on norðdæle se hæfð seofon steorran 7 is forði oðrum naman gehaten Septemtrio þone hatað læwede men Carles wæn se ne gæð næfre adune under ðissere eorðan swa swa oðre tunglan doð. Ac he went abutan hwilon up hwilon adune ofer dæg 7 ofer niht.³

In the Corpus Glossary it occurs in both senses:⁴

Veniculum (for Vehiculum) wægn

Archtoes (= arctos) wægne-pixl.

The dangerous sea that must be crossed is the vast expanse of the sky.⁵ Once in every twenty-four hours the Wain leaves the horizon—which in the latitudes of the British Isles it seems almost to touch⁶—and travels round the Pole Star till it comes down again toward the land. This mysterious and majestic journey is the chief subject of the riddle. The horsemen and horses are the stars near to the Wain, which travel with it. We are told that the eleven horses are loaded under the pole of the Wain. If the horses are stars, this gives perfect sense. The pole of the Wain was a familiar object in the heavens centuries before this riddle was invented; so Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, x. 447), 'Flexerat obliquo plaustrum temone Bootes'—'Boötes had turned his wain with pole aslant'. Under the pole of the Wain is the constellation now called 'Canes Venatici'. This constellation in fact does consist of eleven stars visible to the naked eye. G. F. Chambers, in his catalogue of the stars visible to the eye, gives a

¹ *Die altenglischen Rätsel* (Heidelberg, 1915), p. 84.

² Ed. W. J. Sedgefield (Oxford, 1899), p. 126.

³ Ed. H. Henel (E.E.T.S. 213, 1942), p. 68.

⁴ W. M. Lindsay, *The Corpus Glossary* (Cambridge, 1921), pp. 183, 18.

⁵ I am most grateful to Dr. T. R. Tannahill and Mr. M. W. Ovenden (Glasgow) for their kind assistance with questions of astronomy.

⁶ The Wain was a little higher in the sky at the date of the composition of the riddle.

table of the eleven stars, showing that there is one star of the third magnitude, three between magnitudes 4 and 5, and seven between magnitudes 5 and 5.2.¹ This is the only one of the northern constellations which is shown by him to consist of eleven naked-eye stars.

Of the eleven horses, four are said to be *sceamas* (l. 4). This word does not occur elsewhere in OE.; Holthausen notes, in *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*: '*scéam* m. "Schimmel" (Pferd), zu *scéawian*, *sciene*, vgl. nis. *skjōmi* "Licht, Strahl", ais. ~ "Schwert", *skjōni* "Apfelschimmel".' It is usually translated 'white horses'; it may be that the author of the riddle was thinking of the four stars of the constellation which are noticeably brighter than the others.

I suggest that the sixty horsemen who travel with the Wain are the surrounding stars which circle the sky with it. It seems very probable that 'sixty' here stands for an indefinite number—as we should say 'dozens' or 'scores'. Much evidence for this use of 'sixty' in ME. has been collected by Miss S. I. Tucker,² and dozens of other examples could readily be found. *Lazamon's Brut* and *Piers Plowman*, for instance, contain a great many. In OE., however, the number is not more common than other similar ones, so that the indefinite use cannot be proved. Such a use could, however, have been suggested to any Anglo-Saxon author by Latin practice. Here *sescenti* is used to signify 'an immense number, any amount', perhaps because the Roman cohorts consisted originally of 600 men. The use of *sexaginta* in a similar way is far less common, but is possible; thus Martial (*Epigrams*, xii. 26): '*Sexaginta teras cum limina mane senator . . .*' Alcuin, on being presented with an ivory comb, makes up a kind of riddle about it:³

Mirum animal duo habens capita et dentes lx
non elefantinae magnitudinis sed
eburneae pulchritudinis.

It seems very probable that Riddle 22 is founded upon a famous riddle by Aldhelm:⁴

LIII. Arcturus

Sidereis stipor turmis in vertice mundi:
Esseda famoso gesto cognomina vulgo;
In giro volvens iugiter non vergo deorsum,
Cetera ceu properant cælorum lumina ponto.
Hac gaza ditor, quoniam sum proximus axi,

¹ *Handbook of Astronomy* (Oxford, 1890), iii. 148.

² 'Sixty as an indefinite number in Middle English', *R.E.S.*, xxv (1949), 152-3.

³ Wattenbach and Duemmler, *Monumenta Alcuiniana* (Berlin, 1873), p. 153.

⁴ James Hall Pitman, *The Riddles of Aldhelm* (New Haven, 1925).

Qui Ripheis Scithiæ prælatas montibus errat,
 Vergiliis numeris æquans in arce polorum;
 Pars cuius inferior Stigia Latheaque palude
 Fertur et inferni manibus succumbere nigris.

By starry troops encompassed, I am set
 Upon the vertex of the world; my name
 In common speech is 'wain'. As I revolve
 In one continual circle, my swift path
 I never downward turn, like other stars
 That rush from heaven headlong to the sea.
 I am enriched by this—that I am near
 The axis of the earth, which whirls among
 The far Rhiphæan hills of Scythia.
 In number I am like the Pleiades,
 Set in the sky—the sky, whose lower part
 Stretches to swampy Styx and Lethe's bank,
 Among the black ghosts of the nether world.

It is well known that the OE. Riddles were influenced by Aldhelm. Riddles 35 and 40 are translations from him, but more commonly the OE. riddler takes ideas from Aldhelm and develops them in his own way. Thus, in Riddle 49, 'Book-chest', the idea is taken from Aldhelm, but the OE. riddle is more detailed and colourful than the original. In Riddle 53, an idea probably taken from two lines of Aldhelm's 'De Ariete' has inspired a very pleasing little poem:

Ic seah on bearwe beam hlifian
 tanum torhtne þæt treow was on wynne
 wudu weaxende wæter hine ond eorþe
 feddan fægre oppæt he frod dagum
 on oþrum wearð aglachade
 deope gedolgod dumb in bendum . . .

I suggest that just this kind of use is made of Aldhelm's riddle on the Wain. In the first line can be found the idea of the surrounding troops of stars; in the second line, the idea of the wagon; in the third line, the idea of the journey through the skies. Once the theme is presented to him, the Anglo-Saxon poet allows his imagination to play upon it and produces a fresh and vivid poem.

On this interpretation, many supposed difficulties in the text disappear. Thus, the phrase *hlodan under hrunge* (l. 10) seemed difficult to Bosworth-Toller: 'they stowed them under the rung (the pole that supported the covering?)'. But the phrase is perfectly appropriate to the single pole of the Wain. Again, the phrase *ne of lyfte fleag* (l. 16) seems nonsense to most

modern editors, and to Holthausen,¹ who wish to emend to *ne on lyfte fleag*. Yet the manuscript reading is perfectly true of the Wain, and indeed gives a splendid clue to its position. The manuscript reading *frid hengestas* (l. 4) has been variously interpreted: Bosworth-Toller, under this form, translates 'stately horses', but under the head-word *eored-mæg* translates 'war-horses'. The word *frid* is not otherwise found in OE., and it is sometimes emended, either to *frið* 'peace' (so Tupper and Mackie, 'horses of peace'), or to *frið* 'beautiful, stately'. The latter word is found only once in OE., in Riddle 9; 'mec seo fripe mæg fedde sippan'.² The meaning 'stately' is suitable, and for this meaning we need not emend. Related Germanic forms are Icelandic *friðr* 'handsome', Gothic *freidjan* 'to spare', OHG. *writen* 'to nurse, tend'. The OE. cognate of these words could vary between *frið* and *frid* according to the position of the stress in Primitive Germanic, and neither need be emended.

Riddles in which the stars are likened to horses are rather rare. In the large collection of Archer Taylor,³ for example, we find only the Mongolian:

A rich herd of horses has its pasture
ground in the northwest:—Stars rising;

and the Turkish:

Seven chestnut horses remembered their
own land:—Great Bear.

Similar is an Irish riddle on the Moon:

A White Mare in the Lake,
That her foot never wets,
Though she travel as far as Roscarberry.

The Wain is described as a wagon in the Swedish:

My father has money that no one can count;
he has a sheet that no one can sew;
he has a wagon that no one can push;
he has an apple that no one can bite.

One of the most striking features of OE. Riddle 22, in my view, is the use of a word of double meaning to give a clue to the solution. An occasional pun of this kind is to be found in most collections of riddles; thus,

¹ Review of Mackie's edition in *Anglia Beiblatt*, xlv (1935), 9.

² This reading is that of Tupper, Trautmann, and Krapp-Dobbie. Grein, Wyatt, and Mackie read *fripemæg* as one word.

³ *English Riddles from Oral Tradition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951), pp. 169, 785, 144, 826.

for example, in Archer Taylor's, the following appears almost at the beginning:¹

A riddle, a riddle, as I suppose,
Forty eyes and never a nose.

Many answers are possible, but 'sieve' (a riddle) is obviously the best.

The learned name for the Wain was *Septemtrio*—'The Seven Plough-oxen'. Is it by pure chance that this riddle occurs next to one with the solution 'Plough'?

On the old solution of Riddle 22 a great deal of Tupper's argument about the popular origin of many of the Exeter Book riddles depends, since this was his chief example of an OE. riddle derived from a great popular tradition.² It seems to me rather to be one of the most admirable of the literary riddles of the Exeter Book.

Riddle 58: A Well Sweep

Mackie's text and translation are as follows:³

- | | | |
|----|----------------------|--------------------|
| | Ic wat anfete | ellen dreogan |
| | wiht on wonge | wide ne fereð |
| | ne fela rideð | ne fleogan mæg |
| | þurh scirne dæg | ne hie scip fereð |
| 5 | naca nægledbord | nyt bið hwæpre |
| | hyre [mon]dryhtne | monegum tidum |
| | hafað hefigne steort | heafod lytel |
| | tungan lange | toð nænigne |
| | isernes dæl | eorðgræf pæpeð |
| 10 | wætan ne swelgeþ | ne wiht iteþ |
| | fopres ne gitsað | fered oft swapeah |
| | lagoflod on lyfte | life ne gielpeð |
| | hlafordes gifum | hyred swapeana |
| | peodne sinum | þry sind in naman |
| 15 | ryhte runstafas | þara is rad fruma. |

6 MS. hyre dryhtne. 15 MS. furum.

I know of a creature with one foot
working bravely in a field. It does not travel far,
nor does it ride much, nor can it fly
during the bright day, nor does a ship,
a boat with nailed sides, carry it; nevertheless
it is very often of use to its lord.

¹ No. 12a. See also Archer Taylor, *The Literary Riddle before 1600* (Berkeley, 1948), for puns in Spanish (p. 6), Arabic (p. 23), Latin (p. 57), Greek (p. 43).

² For Tupper's view, see his articles in *M.L.N.*, xviii (1903), 1-8 and 97-106, and the introduction to his edition, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book* (Boston, 1910).

³ *The Exeter Book*, pp. 148-51.

It has a heavy tail, a small head,
 a long tongue, no tooth,
 and much iron. It walks in a pit,
 does not drink liquid, or eat anything,
 has no desire for food; yet it often carries
 water into the air. It does not boast of life,
 of the Lord's gifts; nevertheless
 it obeys its master. In its name, spelt correctly,
 there are three letters; Rad precedes them.

It is clear that the solution must be a well, or part of one. The Anglo-Saxons used a type of apparatus for drawing water still known in many European countries, the well sweep (see *O.E.D.* under *Sweep* sb., 23). This consists of a long beam pivoting on an upright support, which is nearer one end than the other; to the end of the longer, but lighter, part of the beam is attached a pole or a rope which carries the bucket up and down in the well, and the other end of the beam is weighted to help in raising the bucket. Dietrich¹ sees that a well with this kind of apparatus must be meant. He begins with the solution *Ziehbrunnen*, 'draw-well', but after considering the last sentence of the riddle suggests *Rad-burna*, 'riding-well', with reference to the riding cross-beam (that is, the well sweep). Grein and Mackie accept 'riding-well' and Wyatt carries the idea further by writing of such wells 'worked by men riding on them'.² But a better solution is the more restricted one of Holthausen, who points out that the riddle describes only the sweep: 'Aber das Ganze geht gar nicht auf den Brunnen, sondern auf den Schwengel.'³ The solution 'Well Sweep' satisfies all the conditions of the riddle. Its one foot is the support on which it rides; the heavy tail balances the small head and the long 'tongue' holding the bucket.

The real difficulty in this riddle has always been to deduce the OE. form of the solution from the clues contained in the last sentence. During the century since Dietrich's first attempt, there have been two opinions. One group of scholars interpret the last four words of the riddle as meaning that *Rad* appears in the solution—guesses include *rad-burna*, *rad-pyt*, *rad-rod*. The other group look for a word of three letters beginning with *r*, the usual solution being *rod*.

I suggest that the author gives the solution in the form of rune-names. Line 6 contains *mon* (M); line 9 *is* (I); line 12 *lago* (L). As the poet sometimes gives runes in reverse order (e.g. in Riddles 19 and 74), we may confidently read *lim*, 'branch, beam'. He tells us that these three are preceded by *Rad*, so the full solution is *Rad-lim*.

¹ *Z.f.d.A.*, xi, 477.

² *Old English Riddles* (Boston, 1912), p. 107.

³ 'Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik altenglischer Dichter', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, iv (1894), 387.

This compound, like the majority of suggested OE. solutions to this riddle, is not found in extant OE. texts. Much help in its elucidation can be obtained from a long article by Caroline Brady, who summarizes the meanings of the verb *ridan* and the second element *-rad* as follows:¹

For the verb, then, are established the same three principal senses which have been established for the noun, in simplex or in nominal compound: I, 'to ride on horseback,' II, 'to journey,' III, 'to rise and fall'; and an additional principal sense: IV, 'to swing,' 'to sway,' 'to oscillate.' It occurs also in the combinative sense V, to advance in undulations, 'to roll,' or to move forward irregularly with rising and falling, 'to pitch,' or to pitch with an accompanying swaying or rocking, 'to toss'; and in the secondary senses 6, 'to chafe,' and 7 (fig.) 'to ride [as] on horseback.' . . .

The verified senses in which *-rad* is used as the second element in nominal compounds in extant OE. texts are: I, the secondary senses a) 'a ride' or 'raid' (?) and b) 'rider' derived from sense I of the simplex, 'riding on horseback'; II, 'journey,' 'forward movement'; III, 'swell,' 'surge,' 'rising and falling movement' and the combinative 'roll'; IV, 'swinging'; V, 'place of riding.'

The basic element of meaning 'movement' is thus seen to be found sometimes in *ridan* and in *-rad* as the second element of a compound. The same basic idea is therefore to be expected also in *rad-* as the first element of a compound, but evidence for it has not previously been found. I suggest that *Rad-lim* means 'moving beam', referring to the rising and falling movement of the well sweep as it rides upon its support. The only other OE. *rad-* compound that may bear the same idea is *radwerigne*, applied to the sword of Riddle 20; it is certainly a tenable opinion that 'weary of swinging' is a better translation than 'weary of riding on a horse'.

The phrase *ne fela rideð* in line 3 must also be considered. Whether *rideð* means 'rides on horseback' or 'journeys', it is to be understood as a litotes, just as the preceding *wide ne fereð*. Here I believe that a riddle paradox is intended by the author, since the well sweep rides in one sense, though not in this.

Emendations proposed for MS. *furum* (l. 15) include *furðum* (Dietrich); *fruma* (Grein, Mackie); *forma* (Grein, Wyatt); *fultum* (Grein, Tupper); *furma* (Holthausen); *foran* (Krapp-Dobbie). On my interpretation, *fultum* is the best; it is supported by the use of a similar word in Riddle 24 (l. 8), when a solution is being given by runes: *O fulleststeð*.

Runes are used in five other riddles to help in their solution, but this particular cipher is found only in Riddle 42, where Dietrich² detected it in 1859. In that riddle the letters are scrambled:³

¹ 'The Old English nominal compounds in *-rad*', *P.M.L.A.*, lxxvii (1952), 553, 570.

² *Z.f.d.A.*, xi. 473.

³ Mackie, *The Exeter Book*, pp. 138-9.

Ic on flette mæg
 purh runstafas rincum secgan
 þam þe bec witan bega ætsomne
 naman þara wihta þær sceal nyd wesan
 twega oþer ond se torhta æsc
 an an linan acas twegen
 hægelas swa some.

Here on the floor
 I can tell, by means of letters,
 to men that know books, the names of both
 of those creatures together. Need (N) shall be there
 twice over, and the bright Ash (Æ),
 one only in the line, two Oaks (A),
 and two Hail-storms (H) also.

In the *Riddles* the word *runstafas* 'rune letters' is found only twice, in 42 and 58, in both of which a rune-name cipher gives the solution. The word is undoubtedly intended as a warning to the solver to look for the rune-names. The poet has, however, made 58 very much harder to solve than 42, chiefly by using words which are quite familiar and which are scattered throughout the riddle, instead of being all brought together in such a way that the cipher is instantly apparent. Another device he used was to conceal the rune-name *is* in the phrase *isernes dæl*, which is used in two senses: (i) much iron; (ii) a part of the word *isern*. Since he could no doubt easily have used the word *is* 'ice' instead, he evidently intended to make the solution difficult. *Mon* is lacking in the manuscript, but is so plainly required that all editors supply it. The word *lagoflod* 'ocean-flood' is a strange one to use for the amount of water brought up by a bucket; Dietrich says it is 'hyperbolisch für Wasser'. It is much more likely that the poet needed *lago* to stand for *L*. The solution is made a little harder by his inclusion of two other rune-names: *dæg* (D); *gifu* (G). But he tells us to use only three of the rune-names to spell the word required, and there is no doubt which three give the right answer. Nor is it hard to guess why these two riddles are chosen for this treatment. In 42, the poet seems to be attracted by the fact that *hana* and *hæn* are so alike that only four letters need be mentioned to spell both; in 58, the fact that the first element of the compound, *Rad*, is itself a rune-name may have given him the idea of indicating the rest of the answer in the same way.

The form *isern* is of interest. A theory that this riddle must have been written in the south of England could be built on this form, if the following statement by B. Sundby were believed: '*Iren* is found chiefly in poetry (Beow, Gen A, Vesp Ps; cf. OED and B-T), and thus appears to have been the Anglian form. *Ise(r)n* occurs in WS and K texts . . . *s* was a

characteristic of the official WS language, and *r*, of the Anglian dialect. A more exact delimitation of the two types as used in OE does not seem to be possible.¹ But the facts do not support this view. While it is true that in the Vespasian Psalter there are four *r*-forms to only one *s*-form,² in the Corpus Glossary there are seven *s*-forms,³ and in the Lindisfarne Gospels four *s*-forms,⁴ with no *r*-forms in either case. These forms show that no such delimitation of the two types in terms of dialect can be made. Twenty-nine instances⁵ of *iren* are found in the poetry, and only fifteen instances⁶ of *ise(r)n*; but the conclusion to be drawn is not that *iren* is Anglian, but that it was preferred in poetry. The *s*-form, on the other hand, may have been colloquial. This would explain the fact that it is the only form found in the *Riddles*, where it occurs four times. B. von Lindheim has suggested that colloquial words are more likely to be found in the *Riddles* than anywhere else in OE. poetry:⁷ this may be a case in point.

The poet's use of *is*, completely divorced from its normal meaning of 'ice', to stand for 'I', is of great importance for the interpretation of other runes in OE. poetry. For example, the interpretation of the rune for 'U' in the signatures of Cynewulf is still uncertain. R. W. V. Elliott⁸ presents the problem succinctly:

Apart from suggestions like Sievers' 'possession' or Trautmann's substitution of *unne*, the majority of commentators translate 'our' in view of the fact that the Old English pronoun happens to be homonymous with the rune-name. Gollancz justifies this interpretation by referring to the gloss 'noster' in the runic alphabet in MS. Cotton Domitian A ix. In the article previously cited Professor Wrenn, however, points out that this MS. (apart from being at least two centuries later than Cynewulf) is by no means reliable with regard to the names ascribed to the several runes; there are some very obvious blunders. The principal objection to this interpretation, however, is the fact that all rune-names are either nouns or proper names like Ing. No single rune can stand for any other part of speech.

Apart from the gloss 'noster', no evidence has previously been found to show that a homonym of a rune-name could be used in OE.; this use of *isernes dæl*, in my view, is strong evidence.⁹ It may help, also, in the interpretation of the rune for EA, in *The Husband's Message*. If this is to stand

¹ Bertil Sundby, *The dialect and provenance of The Owl and the Nightingale* (Lund, 1950), pp. 188, 192.

² Sweet, *The Oldest English Texts* (E.E.T.S., 1885), pp. 188, 338, 345 (2), 400.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 39, 45, 47, 63, 65, 95, 105.

⁴ Skeat, *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian Versions* (Cambridge, 1871-87): Mt. v. 15; Mk. iv. 21; Mk. iv. 29; Lk. viii. 16.

⁵ Adding *irenendum* (B. 774) to the examples given by Grein.

⁶ Adding *isernscur* (B. 3116) to the examples given by Grein (following Holthausen).

⁷ 'Traces of colloquial speech in OE.', *Anglia*, lxx (1951-2), 22-42.

⁸ 'Cynewulf's Runes in *Christ II* and *Elene*', *English Studies*, xxxiv (1953), 51-52.

⁹ But it does not support such guesses as *cearu*, *cempa*, *ceorl*, *cynn*, for *cen*, or *yfel*, *yst*, *yrming*, for *yr*.

for the rune-name *ear* (which is by no means certain) there is the difficulty that in the *Runic Poem* *ear* seems to mean 'grave', which gives no sense here. To overcome this difficulty, Elliott has first to take the stanza for *iar* as belonging to *ear*, and then to adopt an interpretation of this stanza completely different from that of most commentators.¹ But on the theory that a homonym may be used, *ear* is just as likely to mean 'sea' (the required meaning) as 'grave'. The example of Riddle 58 shows that the runes of the *Riddles* can help in the interpretation of the other runes of OE. poetry.

¹ 'The Runes in "The Husband's Message"', *J.E.G.P.*, liv (1955), 4-5.

THE 'IMPURE ART' OF JOHN WEBSTER

By INGA-STINA EKEBLAD

The art of the Elizabethans is an impure art. . . . The aim of the Elizabethans was to attain complete realism without surrendering any of the advantages which as artists they observed in unrealistic conventions.¹

OBVIOUSLY *The Duchess of Malfi* is an outstanding example of the 'impure art' of the Elizabethans. Here, in one play, Webster plays over the whole gamut between firm convention and complete realism: from the conventional dumb-show—

Here the Ceremony of the Cardinalls enstalment, in the habit of a Souldier: perform'd in delivering up his Crosse, Hat, Robes, and Ring, at the Shrine; and investing him with Sword, Helmet, Sheild, and Spurs: Then Antonio, the Duchesse, and their Children, (having presented themselves at the Shrine) are (by a forme of Banishment in dumbe-shew, expressed towards them by the Cardinall, and the State of Ancona) banished² (III. iv)—

to the would-be realistic pathos of

I pray-thee looke thou giv'st my little boy
Some sirrop, for his cold . . . ; (iv. ii. 207-8)

or from the horror-show of '*the artificiall figures of Antonio, and his children; appearing as if they were dead*' (iv. i. 66-67) to the realization of a character's psychological state, in such lines as Ferdinand's much-quoted 'Cover her face: Mine eyes dazzle: she di'd yong' (iv. ii. 281) or Antonio's 'I have no use | To put my life to' (v. iv. 74-75).

So Webster's dramatic technique needs to be understood in relation to the 'confusion of convention and realism' which Mr. Eliot speaks of; and indeed many critics would in this 'confusion' see the key to Webster's alleged failure as a dramatist. They would say that Webster's method of mixing unrealistic conventions with psychological-realistic representation leads to lack of structure in his plays as wholes.³ It seems, in fact, to have become almost an axiom that when Webster uses conventional dramatic material—such as the various Revenge play devices—it is for show value, 'for effect', and not because the progress of his dramatic action, and the meaning of the play, are vitally tied up with that convention—as they are, for example, in *The Revenger's Tragedy* or *The Atheist's Tragedy*. While

¹ T. S. Eliot, *Selected Essays* (New York, 1950), pp. 96, 97.

² I quote from *The Complete Works of John Webster*, ed. F. L. Lucas (London, 1927).

³ Cf. M. C. Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (2nd edn., Cambridge, 1952), pp. 187, 194, 211.

Tourneur's 'bony lady' is simultaneously an incentive to revenge and a tool for moralizing, the *memento mori* and centre of meaning of the play, Webster's wax figures seem to have no other function than Madame Tussaud's. And while Tourneur's famous speech, 'Do's the Silke-worme expend her yellow labours | For thee? . . .', is closely dependent on, and interacts with, the skull on the stage, Webster's dramatic meaning would appear to inhere in his poetry—such as Bosola's ' . . . didst thou ever see a Larke in a cage?'—irrespective of the dramatic devices employed. Is it, then, only when his poetry fails to do the trick that Webster 'falls back on showmanship',¹ such as 'all the apparatus of dead hands, wax images, dancing madmen and dirge-singing tomb-makers in *The Duchess of Malfi*'?²

Now, while recognizing that in other Elizabethans than Webster (for example Tourneur) the dramatic form is more firmly and consistently controlled by established conventions, we must, on the other hand, not blind ourselves to the richness which may inhere in the very 'confusion' of convention and realism. The two can be confused; but they can also be fused. And I hope to show that Webster—though he often leaves us in confusion—does at his most intense achieve such a fusion, creating something structurally new and vital. This something, however, is very much more elusive to analysis than the more rigidly conventional structures of Tourneur, or the more clearly 'realistic' structure of Middleton (as in *The Changeling*).

I wish to examine *The Duchess of Malfi*, iv. ii—the Duchess's death-scene. It is a part of the play to which no critic of Webster has been indifferent; it stirred Lamb's and Swinburne's most prostrate praise and Archer's most nauseated denunciation, and later critics have only less ardently condemned or lauded it. Its complexity has been sensed, but hardly satisfactorily analysed.³

No one, I think, would deny that this scene contains Webster's most penetrating piece of character-analysis. Through language where juxtaposition of sublime and lowly suggests the tremendous tension in her mind:

Th'heaven ore my head, seemes made of molten brasse,
The earth of flaming sulphure, yet I am not mad:
I am acquainted with sad misery,
As the tan'd galley-slave is with his Oare (iv. ii. 27-30)

¹ *The Age of Shakespeare*, Pelican Guide to English Literature (London, 1955), p. 352.

² W. A. Edwards, 'John Webster', *Scrutiny*, ii (1933), 20. Cf. also Ian Jack, 'The Case of John Webster', *ibid.*, xvi (1949), 38-43.

³ Miss Bradbrook sees this scene as largely symbolical: it represents the Duchess's Hell, or Purgatory (*Themes and Conventions*, p. 197). Miss Welsford, in *The Court Masque* (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 295-6, has some suggestive, though not very clear, comments on symbolical features in this scene.

we follow the Duchess's inner development towards the acceptance of her fate; till finally, though 'Duchesse of *Malfi* still', she humbly kneels to welcome death. And yet, in the midst of this representation of human experience, Webster introduces a pack of howling madmen, to sing and dance and make antic speeches; and as they leave the stage, the whole apparatus of 'dirge-singing tomb-makers', &c., is brought in. How are we to reconcile such apparently opposed elements? The commonly accepted answer is that this is only one more instance of Webster's constant letting us down, his constant sacrifice of unity of design, in order to achieve a maximum effect. But, in a scene which is so clearly the spiritual centre of the play, which verbally—through poetic imagery—gathers together all the chief themes of the play and thus becomes a kind of fulcrum for the poetry, ought we not to devote particular attention to the dramatic technique used, before we pronounce it as grossly bad as the answer suggested above would indicate?

In fact, if we pursue the question why Webster inserted a masque of madmen in a would-be realistic representation of how the Duchess faces death, we shall find that the madmen's masque is part of a larger structural unit—a more extensive masque. Within the scene, this larger masque is being developed on a framework of 'realistic' dramatic representation—the framework itself bearing an analogous relationship to the masque structure. The action of the scene is grasped only by seeing both the basic framework and the masque structure, and the progressive interaction of the two. It is this structural counterpointing of 'convention' and 'realism', this concentrated 'impurity' of art, that gives the scene its peculiar nature; indeed, it contains the meaning of the scene.

By 1613-14, the years of the composition of *The Duchess of Malfi*, the introduction of a masque in a play was a long-established dramatic device. In the Revenge drama, from Kyd onwards, masques were traditionally used to commit revenging murder¹ or otherwise resolve the plot. Furthermore, in the years around the writing of *The Duchess of Malfi* the leading dramatists show a strong interest in the marriage-masque—we need only think of the elaborate showpiece inserted in *The Maid's Tragedy*, or the masques of *The Tempest* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. During these years, any play which includes a marriage seems also almost bound to contain a marriage-masque.²

Now, in *The Duchess of Malfi* it is the Duchess's love and death, her marriage and murder, which are the focal points of the dramatic action.

¹ Cf. Vindice's words: 'A masque is treasons licence, that build upon; | 'Tis murders best face when a vizard's on' (*The Revenger's Tragedy*, v. i. 196-7).

² The two traditions of revenging-murder masque and marriage-masque sometimes meet. See, for example, Middleton's *Women Beware Women* (1625?), where the cupids' arrows are literally deadly, and Hymen himself carries and presents a poisoned cup.

And in iv. ii Webster has, by the very building of the scene, juxtaposed—counterpointed—the two. He has done so by drawing on masque conventions. To see how, and why, we must proceed to a detailed analysis of the scene-structure.

The essence of the masque, throughout its history, was 'the arrival of certain persons vized and disguised, to dance a dance or present an offering'.¹ Although the structure of the early, Tudor, masque had become overlaid with literature (especially, of course, by Ben Jonson) and with show (by those who, like Inigo Jones, thought of the masque primarily in terms of magnificent visual effects), the masques inserted in Jacobean plays—if at all elaborated on—stay close to the simpler structure of the Elizabethan masque. That structure, we may remind ourselves, is as follows:

1. Announcing and presenting of the masquers in introductory speeches (and songs).
2. Entry of masquers.
3. Masque dances.
4. Revels (in which the masquers 'take out' and dance with members of the audience).

A further contact between masquers and audience—especially common when the masque is still near to its original form: groups of disguised dancers suddenly intruding into a festive assembly—can be the presenting of gifts by the masquers to the one, or ones, to be celebrated.

5. Final song (and speeches).

These features all appear in *The Duchess of Malfi*, iv. ii.

As the scene opens, the 'wild consort of Mad-men' is heard off-stage as a 'hideous noyse'. The verbal imagery is preparing for the consciously scenic quality of what is to come. The Duchess turns immediately from her both ominous and ironic remark,² 'And Fortune seemes onely to have her eyesight, | To behold my Tragedy', to the question, 'How now, what noyce is that?' Here a Servant enters, to perform the function of the Announcer

¹ Welsford, *Court Masque*, p. 7. In discussing the masque I also draw on R. Brotanek, *Die englischen Maskenspiele* (Wien, 1902); P. Reyher, *Les Masques anglais* (Paris, 1909); E. K. Chambers's chapter on 'The Masque' in *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), i. 149–212; the chapter on the masque in C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson's edition of Ben Jonson (Oxford, 1925), ii. 249–334; and Allardyce Nicoll, *Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage* (London, 1937).

² Ironic because it echoes back to the wooing-scene, where the Duchess tells Antonio, 'I would have you leade your Fortune by the hand | Unto your marriage bed' (i. i. 567–8). She is here thinking of the traditionally blind figure of Fortune and merely making a playful conceit. Yet unwittingly she is expressing her own blindness to the consequences of her action. And when the image is repeated in iv. ii it is to make the tragic irony explicit. Now Fortune is no longer blind, nor is the Duchess; but what they see is only suffering and death. The Fortune image is used so as to point the almost literal opening of eyes that the action has brought about. Cf. F. L. Lucas's comments on this passage.

of the masque: 'I am come to tell you, | Your brother hath intended you some sport,' and the Duchess answers, by a phrase which in terms of the plot only would seem absurd—for what is her power to give or refuse entry?—but which is natural when coming from someone about to be 'celebrated' with a masque: 'Let them come in.' The arrival of the masquers in *Timon of Athens*, 1. ii, may serve to show that the opening of the scene follows the traditional pattern for the reception of unexpectedly arriving masquers:

TIM. What means that trump?

Enter Servant.

SERV. Please you my lord there are certain ladies most desirous of admittance.

TIM. Ladies? What are their wills?

SERV. There comes with them a forerunner my lord which bears that office to signify their pleasures.

TIM. I pray let them be admitted.

Now the Servant in iv. ii becomes the Presenter of the masque and delivers a speech introducing each of the eight madmen-masquers:

There's a mad Lawyer, and a secular Priest,
A Doctor that hath forfeited his wits
By jealousie: an Astrologian,
That in his workes, sayd such a day o'th'moneth
Should be the day of doome; and fayling of't,
Ran mad: an English Taylor, crais'd i'th'braine,
With the studdy of new fashion: a gentleman usher
Quite beside himselfe, with care to keepe in minde,
The number of his Ladies salutations,
Or 'how do you', she employ'd him in each morning:
A Farmer too, (an excellent knave in graine)
Mad, 'cause he was hindred transportation,
And let one Broaker (that's mad) loose to these,
You'd thinke the divell were among them.

This product of Webster's grim comico-satirical strain is, of course, in terms of realistic plot totally out of place here. Not so, however, if seen in the relevant tradition. From 1608 to 1609 practically every court masque was preceded by an antimasque, often danced by 'antics': 'O Sir, all de better, vor an antick-maske, de more absurd it be, and vrom de purpose, it be ever all de better.'¹ In each of the earlier antimasques, the antic figures were all of a kind, and there was no attempt to differentiate them. It is in the masques performed at the Princess Elizabeth's wedding, in February

¹ Vangoose in Ben Jonson's *The Masque of Augures, With the Severall Antimasques Presented on Twelfth-Night*, 1622.

1613,¹ that individualized comic characters first appear. It is worth noting that Campion's 'twelve franticks . . . all represented in sundry habits and humours' in *The Lords' Masque*—such as 'the melancholicke man, full of feare, the schoole-man overcome with phantasie, the overwatched usurer . . . '—as well as Beaumont's various figures in the second antimasque of *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*, are described in much the same manner as Webster's eight madmen. Webster is here working in an antimasque tradition which was to have many uses in the drama after him. We see it, for instance, in Ford's *The Lover's Melancholy* (1628), which in III. iii has a masque of the same shape as the madmen's interlude in *The Duchess of Malfi*: six different types of Melancholy are described and present themselves; their antic talk is given; and then the Dance, 'after which the masquers run out in couples'.

After the presentation, the masquers themselves appear—'Enter Madmen'—and one of them sings a song to what the stage directions describe as 'a dismall kind of Musique'.² Even without the music, there is plenty of dismalness in the jarring jingle of the words:

O let us howle, some heavy note,
some deadly-dogged howle,
Sounding, as from the threatning throat,
of beastes, and fatall fowle.

Webster's audience had the benefit of the musical setting, which, according to Mr. Cutts, 'makes a vivid and forceful attempt to convey the horror of the imagery of owls, wolves and harbingers of death'. The antimasquers at the court of James frequently appeared in the shape of animals;³ and it seems that, for example, the madmen-masquers ordered for the wedding of Beatrice Joanna in *The Changeling* were to wear animal disguises. Stage directions in *The Changeling* tell us: 'Cries of madmen are heard within, like those of birds and beasts', and the explicit comments on this are:

Sometimes they [madmen] imitate the beasts and birds,
Singing or howling, braying, barking; all
As their wild fancies prompt 'em. (III. iii. 206-8)

¹ Three masques, by Campion, Beaumont, and Chapman respectively, were performed on the occasion. The possibility that Webster directly imitates Campion's masque of madmen has been pointed out; and John P. Cutts, 'Jacobean Masque and Stage Music', *Music and Letters*, xxxv (1954), 193, suggests that 'it is Robert Johnson's music which is involved in the transference . . . of the madmen's antimasque from *The Lords' Masque* to *The Dutchesse of Malfy*'. What I am concerned with here, however, is not imitation or adaptation as such, but the fact of a common tradition.

² The setting, which had been broken in two in B.M. Add. MS. 29481 and wrongly catalogued, has recently been reassembled by John P. Cutts. He ascribes it, conjecturally, to Johnson. See *Music and Letters*, xxxiii (1952), 333-4.

³ Cf. A. H. Thorndike, 'Influence of the Court-Masque on the Drama, 1608-15', *P.M.L.A.*, xv (1900), 114-20.

Here, then, is another antimasque tradition drawn upon in *The Duchess of Malfi*. The bestiality of these madmen comes out chiefly in the imagery of the song:

As Ravens, Scrich-owles, Bulls and Beares,
We'll bell, and bawle our parts.

But we may be helped by other madmen-antimasquers to imagine, visually and aurally, how the song, and indeed the whole interlude, was executed.

Directly after the song various madmen speak for themselves, in a series of disjointed speeches which verbally link this episode with main themes of the whole play. Images of hell-fire, of madness and bestiality (preparing, of course, for Ferdinand's lycanthropy)—to mention only the most important—are concentrated here. After the speeches follows '*the Daunce, consisting of 8. Mad-men, with musicke answerable thereunto*'. It is left to us to imagine the lumbering movements and discordant tunes which this passus must have contained; yet we should not forget that, though there is only a bare reference to it in the stage directions, the dance must have been the climax of the madmen's interlude. Now, it is not 'from the purpose', but truly meaningful, that in the centre of *The Duchess of Malfi* there should be this antic dance, accompanied by these incoherent words and discordant tunes. We know that to the Elizabethans the unity and coherence of macrocosm and microcosm alike was naturally expressed as a dance:

Dancing, the child of Music and of Love,
Dancing itself, both love and harmony,
Where all agree and all in order move,
Dancing, the art that all arts do approve,
The fair character of the world's consent,
The heavn's true figure, and th'earth's ornament.¹

And so the climactic dance would be particularly significant in the marriage-masque, the purpose of which was to celebrate the union brought about by the power of Love. Ben Jonson built his *Hymenaei* (1606) round this idea,² and the central dance of that masque is a 'neate and curious measure', accompanied by the following chorus:

Whilst all this *Roofe* doth ring,
And each discording string,
With every varied voyce,
In Union doth reioyce. (306-9)

The dance in *The Duchess of Malfi*, on the contrary, acts as an ideograph

¹ Sir John Davies, *Orchestra*, ll. 666-71.

² There is an admirable discussion of the theme of Union in *Hymenaei* in D. J. Gordon's *Hymenaei: Ben Jonson's Masque of Union*, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, viii (1945), 107-45. See esp. pp. 118-19.

of the *dis*-unity, the *in*-coherence, of the Duchess's world. It acts as a visual and aural image of what the action of the play has led to, the difference between the happiness and unity of the wooing-scene, imaged as the most perfect movement and melody:

ANT. And may our sweet affections, (like the Sphears)
Be still in motion.

DUCH. Quickning, and make
The like soft Musique. (I. i. 551-4)

and this scene where the Duchess herself has found that

... nothing but noyce, and folly
Can keepe me in my right wits. (IV. ii. 6-7)

By now it should be possible to say that the madmen's masque is not just 'Bedlam-broke-loose', as Archer, and with him many, would have it. Nor do we need to excuse this interlude, as has been done, by saying that Webster is not alone in it; that there are plenty of madmen in Elizabethan drama, and Webster's Bedlam stuff is as good as any. Such an excuse does not save the scene, as a piece of dramatic art, from damnation. But we are beginning to see the masque as peculiarly functional in the play. We have seen its connexions with antimasque conventions; now we must see how it is related to the events that are represented on the stage.

In fact, there are reasons to believe that in this masque there is a nucleus of folk tradition, the bearing of which on the action of the play justifies the inclusion of the masque.

The widowhood of the Duchess is much stressed throughout the play—from the brothers' interview with her in the very first scene, around the motto, 'Marry? they are most luxurious, | Will wed twice' (I. i. 325-6). It is well known that objections to second marriages were still strong at the beginning of the seventeenth century. We need go no farther than Webster's own *Characters*, 'A Vertuous Widdow' and 'An Ordinarie Widdow',¹ to get a notion of how strong they were. Early in 1613 Chapman's satiric comedy *The Widow's Tears* (1605-6), in which the 'luxury' of two widows provided the plot, had had a successful revival. The general attitude to widows' marriages was to see them as 'but a kind of lawful adultery, like usury permitted by the law, not approved; that to wed a second was no better than to cuckold the first'.² And in Webster's source, Painter's translation of Belleforest's story of the Duchess of Malfi, the Duchess is an *exemplum horrendum* to all women contemplating a second marriage:

You see the miserable discourse of a Princesse loue, that was not very wyse, and of a Gentleman that had forgotten his estate, which ought to serue for a lookinge

¹ *Works*, ed. Lucas, iv. 38-39.

² *The Widow's Tears*, II. iv. 28-31 (in Chapman's *Comedies*, ed. T. M. Parrott, London, 1911).

Glasse to them which be ouer hardy in making Enterprises, and doe not measure their Ability wyth the greatnesse of their Attemptes . . . foreseeing their ruine to be example for all posterity. . . .¹

Webster's Duchess, newly widowed, marries again, and marries a man in degree far below her—in fact one of her servants. Those are the facts on which the plot of the play hinges; they comprise her double 'crime'. But they also explain the point of the mental torture which, in the coming of the madmen, Ferdinand has devised for his sister.² For the madmen's interlude—such as we know it from Webster's stage directions, and such as we divine it from the sung and spoken words—is strikingly similar to a kind of *ludus*, one of the predecessors of the masque proper, namely the *charivari*.

Du Cange defines *charivarium* thus: 'Ludus turpis tinnitibus & clamoribus variis, quibus illudunt iis, qui ad secundas convolant nuptias', and *O.E.D.* refers to Bayle's *Dictionnaire*: 'A Charivari, or Mock Music, given to a Woman that was married again immediately after the death of her husband.' The *charivari* as such was a French *ludus*, or marriage-baiting custom, dating from the latter part of the Middle Ages,³ 'originally common after all weddings, then directed at unpopular or unequal matches as a form of public censure'.⁴ But the practice which the word stands for was not limited to France. English folk-customs and folk-drama knew the equivalent of the French *charivari*⁵—indeed a descendant of it was still known when Hardy put his skimmington-ride into *The Mayor of Casterbridge*. In the early seventeenth century a widow in an English village, marrying one of her late husband's servants, might well be visited by a

¹ William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure*, ed. J. Jacobs (London, 1890), iii. 43.

² One meaning of the device is, of course, to drive the Duchess mad, the irony of the scene being that it has exactly the opposite effect: it leads to terrifying clearness of vision and composure of mind in the Duchess. See Ferdinand's motivation in iv. i. 151-6: 'And ('cause she'll needes be mad) I am resolv'd . . .'. But this still does not explain why the scene was given just the form it has.

³ The most famous *charivari* of all is the one at the French court on 29 January 1393. A wedding was taking place between 'un jeune chevalier de Vermandois' and 'une des damoisselles de la reine', who was a widow. Disguised as 'hommes sauvages', King Charles VI and five of his lords suddenly entered the hall of the festivities, making queer gestures, uttering horrible wolfish cries, and performing an antic dance. (Cf. Welsford, *Court Masque*, p. 44.) In the end the masquers caught fire; and though the King himself survived, he never quite recovered from the shock. See Froissart's account in *Collection des Chroniques Nationales Françaises* . . ., ed. J. A. Buchon (Paris, 1825), xiii. 140-9, particularly Buchon's note, p. 142: 'Le moine anonyme de St. Denis dit que "C'étoit une coutume pratiquée en divers lieux de la France, de faire impunément mille folies au mariage des femmes veuves et d'emprunter avec des habits extravagants la liberté de dire des vilénies au mari et à l'épousee".' (My italics.)

⁴ Funk and Wagnall, *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend* (New York, 1949), i. 212.

⁵ See E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), i. 393.

band of ruffians, showing their disapproval through clamour and antic dances. Often we can trace the antimasque of a courtly masque back to village *ludi*. Clearly the connexion between the grotesque dances of antimasques and various popular celebrations was, as Miss Welsford says, 'still felt, if not understood, in the seventeenth century' (*Court Masque*, p. 29). And so I do not think it too far-fetched to assume that the spectators at the Globe and the Blackfriars would have seen in the 'clamoribus variis' of Webster's madmen a kind of *charivari* put on to 'mock' the Duchess for her remarriage. They would then have seen a meaning in Ferdinand's (and Webster's) device which totally escapes us when we see it as just one Bedlam episode among many. For, if seen as related to the *charivari* tradition, the madmen's masque becomes a contrivance of cruel irony on the part of Ferdinand: in a sense, the Duchess is here being given her belated wedding entertainment. The Duchess is of 'royall blood', and the wedding of such an elevated person would have had to be celebrated with some show allegorically bearing on the occasion. The year 1613, because of the spectacular celebrations of the Princess Elizabeth's wedding, was, above all years in the period, a year of marriage festivities. So the audience would be particularly prepared to respond to the masque-features of this Webster scene. And in that response would be the realization of the dissimilarities of this masque from such masques as did honour to the Princess and her Count Palatine, or the one Prospero put on for Miranda. The Duchess's masque, as far as we have followed it, is all antimasque, all a grotesque mockery; but that is not in itself the point. It is the cruel twist of this mockery, as the madmen's interlude turns out to be merely the antimasque prelude to a kind of main masque, which strikes home.

Traditionally, after the masquers had danced 'their own measure', they would be ready to 'take out' members of the audience to dance. It is this feature—the involving of the spectators in the proceedings—which more than anything else distinguishes the masque as an art form from the drama. And now the Duchess is indeed 'taken out'. For directly upon the madmen's 'own measure', Bosola, masqued '*like an old man*', enters, and his 'invitation', or summons, to the Duchess is as conclusive as could be: 'I am come to make thy tombe.' The Duchess has for a while been as much a passive spectator as anyone in the audience. Now, with a sudden change, she takes part in what is happening. Bosola's disguise is like that of the traditional masque image of Time;¹ and his appearance, while again focusing our attention on the Duchess, turns the mock wedding-masque into what

¹ Cf. for example Time in Jonson's masque *Time Vindicated*; or Queen Elizabeth's coronation, when in a pageant 'issued one personage, whose name was Tyme, apparayelled as an olde man, with a scythe in his hand . . .' (J. Nichols, *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1823), i. 50).

reminds us of a Dance of Death. The text of this 'dance' is Bosola's words:

Thou art a box of worme-seede, at best, but a salvatory of greene mummye: what's this flesh? a little cruded milke, phantasticall puffe-paste: our bodies are weaker then those paper prisons boyes use to keepe flies in: more contemptible: since ours is to preserve earth-wormes. . . .

From the point of view merely of plot this is a rather extravagant way of saying: 'Like all men, you are a worthless creature', or something of the kind. But we see now that this speech is as much fed with meaning by the masque structure around it as is Tourneur's skull-speech by the presence of the *memento mori*. Webster's practical joke is not as spectacular as Tourneur's, and there is none of the grotesque fun of the 'bony lady' in it; but it has some of the effect of Mutability entering into an Epithalamium, or of the skeleton Death joining the masque-dancers at the Jedburgh Abbey marriage-feast.¹ In the lines just quoted there is all the medieval sense of the perishable nature of all things, and this sense deepens as Bosola's focus widens:

. . . didst thou ever see a Larke in a cage? such is the soule in the body: this world is like her little turfe of grasse, and the Heaven ore our heades, like her looking glasse, onely gives us a miserable knowledge of the small compasse of our prison.

There is a pointed consistency in the movement of thought, through associatively linked images,² from the nothingness of the Duchess's body to the despicableness of all flesh, to the plight of the soul in the body and of man in the universe—the correspondence between microcosm and macrocosm enabling Webster to move from one to the other in the last image. All that remains is to be absolute for death.

But the end of the masque is not yet reached. In the course of Bosola's and the Duchess's dialogue, horrible life is given to the masque convention of presenting gifts:

Here is a present from your Princely brothers,
And may it arrive wel-come, for it brings
Last benefit, last sorrow.

¹ Alexander III of Scotland in 1285 married Joleta, daughter of the Count de Dreux. At their marriage-feast in Jedburgh Abbey, 'while a band of maskers danced before the king and queen, Death in the form of a skeleton appeared in their midst and struck terror into spectators and performers alike' (P. Hume Brown, *History of Scotland* (Cambridge, 1902), i. 128-9). Cf. R. Withington, *English Pageantry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1918-20), i. 103.

² The box containing worm-seed (the pun on the two senses of 'anthelmintic medicine' and 'seed producing maggots' should be noticed, for in the sense of 'medicine' the image is parallel to the subsequent 'salvatory of greene mummye') becomes the paper prison with flies in it, the flimsiness of which was prepared for by the intervening 'puffe-paste'. The paper prison becomes the birdcage (which image has an extra layer of meaning because of its connexion with the actual dramatic situation of the imprisoned Duchess). Each image derives from, but adds to and develops, a preceding image.

The gifts are 'a Coffin, Cords, and a Bell', presented by the Executioner. One is reminded of a passage in *The White Devil* where Brachiano, who is about to be strangled—also for a love-crime—is told, 'This is a true-love knot | Sent from the Duke of Florence' (v. iii. 175-6). The parallelism is such that it is tempting to see in the earlier image the seed of an idea worked out more fully in *The Duchess of Malfi*.¹

By this time we are ready for a change of guise in Bosola. He becomes 'the common Bell-man' (who used to ring his bell for the condemned in Newgate on the night before their execution), and accompanied by the bell he sings his dirge: 'Hearke, now every thing is still.' The situation has turned like that threatened by the King in *Philaster*, v. iii:

I'll provide
A masque shall make your Hymen turn his saffron
Into a sullen coat, and sing sad requiems
To your departing souls.

The dirge would answer to the concluding song of the masque; and it is here part and conclusion of the Duchess's masque. In fact, through the death-imagery of Bosola's song, we hear epithalamic echoes. The invocation,

The Schritch-Owle, and the whistler shrill,
Call upon our Dame, aloud,

refers, of course, to the harbinger of death so often mentioned in Elizabethan-Jacobean drama and poetry. But it also stands out as the very reverse of the traditional epithalamic theme of averting evil in the shape of birds²—as in Spenser's *Epithalamion*, 345-6:

Let not the shriech Oule, nor the Storke be heard:
Nor the night Rauen that still deadly yels,

or the last stanza of the marriage-song in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, I. i:

The crow, the slanderous cuckoo, nor
The boding raven, nor chough hoar,
Nor chattering pie,
May on our bridehouse perch or sing,
Or with them any discord bring,
But from it fly.

Further, the Duchess is bidden to prepare herself:

Strew your haire, with powders sweete:
Don cleane linnen, bath your feete.

¹ Cf. also the notion of masque in the last scene of *The White Devil*: Lodovico and Gasparo, 'disguised', entering to murder Flamineo and Vittoria, introduce themselves ironically: 'We have brought you a Maske' (v. vi. 170).

² See J. A. S. McPeck, *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain* (Harvard, 1939), ch. vii.

Preparation for death, this is; and the strewing of her hair could be taken as a penitential act, or simply as referring to the new fashion¹—a cruel echo of her happy chatting in the bedchamber scene, just before disaster descends:

Doth not the colour of my haire 'gin to change?
When I waxe gray, I shall have all the Court
Powder their haire, with Arras, to be like me. (III. ii. 66-68)

But one may also hear an echo of Ben Jonson's *Hymenaei* where the 'personated Bride' has her haire 'flowing and loose, *sprinkled with grey*' (my italics)²—an idea which was to be taken up by Donne in the fourth stanza of his *Epithalamion* on the Earl of Somerset's wedding on 26 December 1613, to be made the basis of a witty conceit:

Pouder thy Radiant haire,
Which if without such ashes thou would'st weare,
Thou which to all which come to looke upon,
Art meant for Phoebus, would'st be Phaeton.

So the Duchess's preparations for the 'laying out' of her dead body have cruel reminiscences of those connected with the dressing of the bride. And, finally, the end and climax of the dirge,

'Tis now full tide, 'twene night, and day,
End your groane, and come away,

strongly suggests the traditional exhortation at the end of the epithalamium, referring to the impatiently awaited night of the bridal bed: Catullus's lines 'sed abit dies: | perge, ne remorare' (*Carmen*, lxi. 195-6) and their echo through practically every Elizabethan-Jacobean epithalamium, as—to give only one example—the final lines in Campion's *The Lords' Masque*:

No longer wrong the night
Of her Hymenean right,
A thousand Cupids call away,
Fearing the approaching day;
The cocks already crow:
Dance then and go!

¹ Powdering the hair was just coming into fashion in England at this time (F. L. Lucas in *Works*, i. 255).

² That Jonson had most likely misinterpreted his source-books and made a mistake when he described the Roman bride as having her hair strewn with grey does not alter the argument (see my note on *Hymenaei*, *N. & Q.*, cci (1956), 510-11).

And so the Duchess goes, not to an ardent bridegroom, but to 'violent death'.¹ It is the culminating irony of the scene.

There is clearly a close kinship between iv. ii and the wooing-scene in Act I. While the death-scene is interwoven with marriage-allusions, Death is very much there in the scene where the marriage *per verba de presenti* takes place. We hear, for instance, of the Duchess's will (playing, of course, on the two senses of 'testament' and 'carnal desire'), of winding-sheets, and of a kiss which is a *Quietus est*; of the 'figure cut in Allablaster | Kneeles at my husbands tombe', and of a heart which is 'so dead a peece of flesh'. There is, however, one crucial difference between the two scenes. In the wooing-scene, the counterpointing of marriage and death is entirely verbal: it is through 'uncomical puns' and apparently irrelevant images that sinister associations are fused with the dramatic situation. In iv. ii, on the other hand, Webster has used the very building of the scene to express something of that typically Jacobean paradox which is contained in the two senses of the word 'die'. The masque elements in the Duchess's death-scene, then, are truly functional. Unlike, say, the masque in *The Maid's Tragedy*, which is a self-contained piece of theatre (it is justified in the play as a whole by acting as an ironic foil to the actual wedding-night which follows), the masque in *The Duchess of Malfi* gathers into itself all the essential conflicts of the play. And it does so on all levels: from the pure plot conflict between the Duchess and her brothers, involving questions of revenge and persecution, to the deep thematic clashes of love and death, man and Fate, which much of the poetry of the play is nourished by.

So Act iv, scene ii of *The Duchess of Malfi* gives an insight into Webster's 'impure art'. The scene as a whole neither fits into a realistic scheme of

¹ It need hardly be said that the parallel death-bed/bridal-bed is often drawn on in the drama of these years. The most spectacular instance is perhaps in *The Maid's Tragedy*, II. i, where the deserted Aspatia helps to put Evadne to bed, the two women being played off against each other as 'bed' against 'bier'. It was such exquisite horror that was inherited from the Jacobeans by Beddoes—see, for example, *Death's Jest Book*, IV. iii. 230-57 (ed. H. W. Donner, London, 1950), where Athulf sings a song intended to be simultaneously his own dirge and his beloved's epithalamium:

A cypress-bough, and a rose-wreath sweet,
A wedding-robe, and a winding-sheet,
A bridal-bed and a bier.

Death and Hymen both are here.

But one might note that the parallel, or contrast, could also be used in the most matter-of-fact manner:

Lift up thy modest head,
Great and fair bride; and as a well-taught soul
Calls not for Death, nor doth controul
Death when he comes, come thou unto this bed.

(Sir Henry Goodere, 'Epithalamion of the Princess' Marriage', 1613; in *English Epithalamies*, ed. R. H. Case, London, 1896.)

cause and effect or psychological motivation, nor does it consistently embody convention. It balances between those two alternatives. It is a precarious balance, and at other points we see Webster losing it. But in this scene he holds the tension between the two and draws strength from both sides—the kind of strength which tempts one to suggest that Webster's art is most 'impure' at the centres of meaning in his plays; that his peculiar skill, not only as a dramatic poet but as a poetic dramatist, lay in the ability to utilize the very impurity of his art.

But when, finally, we try to see how Webster holds the balance between convention and realism, we seem to find that it is by poetic means: within the scene, the masque is related to the 'realistic' dramatic representation of what happens, in the manner of a poetic analogy. That is, the Duchess's marriage, leading to her murder, is like a marriage-masque turned into a masque of Death. The two chief structural components of the scene are: (1) the plot situation—the Duchess imprisoned and put to death, because she has remarried, and (2) the *charivari*-like antimasque of madmen, developing into a masque of Death. In pursuing the interconnexion between these two, we have come to see that they are best understood as two halves of one metaphor, certainly 'yoked by violence together', but in the end naturally coming together, to give the full meaning of the scene. Conventional masque elements—such as Webster's original audience would have known from other plays—have helped to give Webster a structure on which to build up the most pregnant irony. The irony is there in the basic analogy between the represented human situation and the masque. It is clinched at individual points, when the analogy is most forcible—that is, at each new stage in the masque. And the irony culminates when the two parts of the analogy become interchangeable: the Duchess becomes 'involved' in the masque, and her fate becomes one with the progress of the masque. Also, as in any effective metaphor, the implications reach beyond the immediate situation: in Bosola's worm-seed speech not only the Duchess but—in the manner of the *Danse Macabre*—all flesh and all things are involved. What Webster wanted to say here he could say in no other way. What he does say we can understand only by grasping the technique of the scene.

VERSE AND ITS FEET

By M. WHITELEY

I. *The Theory*

THE following remarks on the scansion of traditional English verse take as their point of departure the comments on Milton's prosody made by Professor F. T. Prince in *The Italian Element in Milton's Verse* (Oxford, 1954).¹ Discussion will be confined to:

- (a) the English ten-syllabled line, with or without rhyme, in what is usually called rising rhythm (the line which was once called the 'iambic pentameter'); and
- (b) the question of stress, without regard to possible variations in the number of syllables.

Mr. Prince's book has obvious merits; but the short chapter on Milton's prosody is less than convincing. Its weakness appears plainly in its disagreement with the account of Milton's prosody given by Robert Bridges in his famous treatise (Oxford, 1921). Bridges's own summary of his method is quoted by Mr. Prince, and must be taken as a starting-point:

In this treatise the scheme adopted . . . is to assume a normal regular line, and tabulate all the variations as exceptions to that norm.

For this purpose English blank verse may conveniently be regarded as a decasyllabic line on a disyllabic basis and in rising rhythm (i.e. with accents or stresses on the alternate even syllables) and the disyllabic units may be called *feet*. (p. 1)

Mr. Prince objects to these principles as deriving from the very view that Bridges set out to displace. He notes that Bridges was writing against the habit of 'most of our classical scholars' of regarding 'the ten-syllable verse of Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton as so many better or worse attempts to compose regular, alternately stressed, so-called iambic lines, broken here and there by the negligent admission of "superfluous" syllables' (Bridges, p. 84). But he holds that Bridges 'did not attack the traditional assumptions with sufficient boldness' (Prince, p. 136; see also pp. 143-4); and he argues that what Bridges has really done 'is to concede to the traditional view that English prosody must be interpreted in terms of classical prosody. This is what he concedes in regarding the decasyllabic

¹ This article takes the form of an attack on some of Professor Prince's views. I should like to say here that while the arguments are mine, the work of putting Part I into a form fit for publication has been Mr. Prince's own, involving an expenditure of time and trouble for which I cannot be sufficiently grateful. One thing only I should have put more strongly than it now appears—my very real admiration for his book.

line as "on a disyllabic basis and in rising rhythm", and in calling "the disyllabic units" feet. It is precisely these conceptions which have weighed most heavily on all theories of English prosody" (p. 137). He also dislikes Bridges's 'method of painstaking tabulation of "inversions" in various "feet", variations from one falsely assumed norm', and objects to 'all these impositions of arbitrary rules' (p. 138).

Bridges's terminology is in fact unhappy, and might mislead, if one read no farther than the first passage quoted above. He uses the terms 'norm' and 'normal regular line' instead of the more accurate 'base' and 'basic pattern' of Lascelles Abercrombie's *Principles of English Prosody*, Part I (London, 1923); and tabulates, as he tells us, 'variations' as 'exceptions'. But no one with an open mind could mistake Bridges's intention as it appears in the treatise as a whole. For instance, he says: 'There is no one place in the verse where an accent is indispensable' (p. 39). Can such freedom as this be derived from classical prosody?

Nor does Mr. Prince object only to Bridges's terminology: he objects to our taking the line to be 'on a disyllabic basis and in rising rhythm' and particularly to the notion of the 'foot'. His own laws for Milton's blank verse are 'simply an equivalent of the principles underlying the Italian hendecasyllable' (p. 143); and here he quotes from Bembo's *Prose della Volgare Lingua* (1525), and concludes:

(a) The line has a theoretic ten syllables (not eleven, as in Italian).

(b) The tenth syllable must always have, or be capable of being given, a stress; one other stress must fall, in any one line, on either the fourth or the sixth syllable. (p. 143)

It has been necessary to set out these assertions in some detail in order to prepare for the discussion of those points on which Mr. Prince must be challenged. These are:

(a) His own setting up of 'rules' which are not only unnecessary but untrue to the facts, and which can and should be disputed.

(b) His elimination of 'feet'. The notion of the foot is essential to the full experiencing of the rhythm of the English ten-syllabled line as traditionally written and read.

To deal first with (a): there is no 'rule'—i.e. there is no universal practice on the part of poets—that a stress must fall on the tenth syllable of the line in English verse; and there is no 'rule'—in the same sense—that a stress must fall on either the fourth or the sixth syllable of the line in English (or perhaps even in Italian) verse. Evidence on these points, for English, will be given later.

There is only one rule, and it evades all fixity. It is that the 'given' stress pattern of the line may be varied in any way whatever, provided that

the line can still be read and felt as a variation of that given pattern. It will be asked, 'felt by whom?' And the answer is, 'By any experienced and moderately sensitive reader of verse'. It is in fact possible to feel, as highly effective, much more strongly varied lines than we are accustomed to consider. It may be that a whole line in falling rhythm, occurring in verse of predominantly rising rhythm, would be felt as a departure from the pattern too complete to be accepted, or it may be that even this variation would pass. A line must be judged on its merits, as it occurs. It is certainly possible to accept three or four falling stresses in a line, as in Dante's

Poscia vid'io mille visi cagnazzi (*Inferno*, xxxii. 70)

or Donne's

His soul out of one hell into a new. (*Elegy*, i. 8)

The view of metrical variation just expressed is not new; it may be found in Abercrombie's book, pp. 36 ff. But the lack of interest of late years in all questions of scansion seems to have led to its being forgotten.

To come to (b), the question of 'feet' (or a basic pattern of disyllabic rising rhythm): this may be approached in two ways, first as a matter of logic, secondly as following from the evidence of our experience in reading verse.

The statement (deriving from Bembo) that there must be a stress on the tenth and on either the fourth or the sixth syllable of the line points to certain logical conclusions, since all the syllables mentioned are even syllables. There are in the abstract three possibilities:

1. A ten-syllabled line might be in disyllabic falling rhythm. But Bembo's line cannot be, for it demands at least two stresses on *even* syllables while making no demand for the odd.
2. The line may be disyllabic, but free to be of either predominantly rising or predominantly falling rhythm. But if we apply Bembo's rule, the poet may write lines which have five feet in rising rhythm, but never lines which have five, or even four, in falling rhythm.
3. The line may be in predominantly (or even uniformly) rising rhythm, and conform to Bembo's rule.

It would seem, then, that Bembo's rule implies that the predominant or basic pattern is rising rhythm.

There is, however, a fourth logical possibility: that the line is not on a disyllabic basis at all. It may then follow any rhythmic pattern to which its stresses will conform, so that we may read in Milton:

Burnt after | them to the | bottomless | pit. (*P.L.*, vi. 866)

or in Donne:

Both the year's | and the day's | deep mid|night is. (*St. Lucy's Day*, 45)

This would be to regard the line somewhat as M. Grammont regards the French Alexandrine—as having a variable number of ‘measures’. It means that Milton writes a line of ten syllables which may be at one moment a line of five measures, at another of four, at another of three. Mr. Prince does not seem to mean this. And in any case, have we not, in the two examples given, simply a change to a four-foot line on a predominantly trisyllabic base? In the line from Donne the reader who thus scans thinks he is keeping to the facts, showing how we ‘really’ read the line, while all counterpointing against a constant rhythmic base (which to some seems a prime fact of the experience of reading verse) vanishes. There may be real danger of such a view being generally adopted (cf. Bridges, p. 38): it would tabulate various types of ‘real’ line-rhythm as if these represented the *whole* reality of the rhythms of verse.

Leaving this last possibility aside, however, we come back to the only other logical possibility: that Bembo’s rule implies a line in disyllabic rising rhythm, of which the rhythmic base may be represented as:

x | x | x | x | x |

where x represents an unstressed, and | a stressed syllable. And the whole art of writing in this measure is to vary the actual lines against the notional pattern so that every variation (*or* conformity) is felt and enjoyed though not necessarily consciously analysed.

The second way to demonstrate the existence of ‘feet’ is from our sensory experience of verse.

If we deny that there is this basic pattern, what is the effect on our reading? It may be shown by looking at the repetition of a phrase within the line, a device particularly effective if the traditional reading is observed (the stressing given makes no claim to be the only or the best interpretation; disagreement upon details will not, I hope, invalidate the argument that follows. The sign " shows exceptionally strong stress):

Non pian|ger an|co, non | pianger | ancora (*Purgatorio*, xxx. 56)

Yet once | more, O | ye lau|rels, and | once more (*Lycidas*, 1)

Weep no | more, woe|ful shep|herds, weep | no more (*ibid.*, 165)

Curled or | uncurled, | since locks | will-turn | to grey;

Since paint|ed or | not paint|ed, all | shall fade (*Rape of the Lock*, v. 26–27)

In Dante’s line the first *pian* has a stress coinciding with the basic pattern,

the second goes against it; and the opposite is true for *non*. If we accept a pattern of 'feet', i.e. pairs of syllables of which the first and second set up different expectations as to stress, we have a single phrase played off against the base in two different patterns. But if the base is simply a line of ten syllables with no different expectation as to stress on odd or even, that deliberate varying of pattern disappears. We may even be expected to read Dante's line with precisely similar enunciation of *non pianger* in each instance—if that is possible. This at any rate appears to follow from the dismissal of 'feet'—from the conception of a ten-syllabled line with no constant pattern beyond its ten syllables and its two stresses.

Similar considerations apply to the two lines from *Lycidas*, and may be made clearer by a glance at the lines from Pope. With the foot dismissed, *Curled or uncurled* offers, as a stress pattern, (roughly) | x | x, and as a syllabic pattern, a b c a, where 'a' is first the stronger and then the weaker syllable in a pair. But with the foot accepted, the phrase offers not only these patterns, but also the element of surprise: the first *curled* is unexpectedly stressed, the second unexpectedly unstressed. So in the next line the first *paint* is expectedly stressed, the second unexpectedly unstressed (i.e. is the weaker syllable in its pair). How much of the subtlety of the poet's craft is lost if we refuse to recognize that the line is 'on a disyllabic basis and in rising rhythm'.

It seems that we tend to forget how little scansion can show of the workings of verse, and how very little scansion, indeed, claims to show. The foot is notional, a pattern in the mind, though none the less present and effective. So too is the basic pattern of stress, though every written line may vary it in one way or another. Lascelles Abercrombie understood this as well as anyone. Yet even he, having explained it as clearly as one could wish, is betrayed into a feeling (*Principles*, pp. 103-4 and 115) that scansion ought to show, after all, not the notional pattern and the variations upon it, but how we really read the lines (which scansion has never pretended to do). Bridges too at one point remarks (and Mr. Prince rightly objects to this, though presumably for the wrong reasons) that 'Milton came to scan his verses in one way, and to read them in another' (Bridges, p. 35). But we do not read verse as we scan it, and this is quite easy to show. In the lines:

But of | that clock | within | our breasts | we bear
The sub|tle mo|tions we | forget | the while

we do not read:

The sub tle mo tions we forget the while.

The foot-divisions are in the mind. What we really read is:

The subtle motions we forget the while

(if I may be allowed by spacing to suggest phrasing). Scansion does

not attempt to show how syllables and words cohere in the reading, any more than it shows differences of pitch. It is simply not a notation for that.¹

The notation of scansion has this peculiarity: that the lines of foot-division mark the *notional* pattern, while the marks of stress follow the *actual* sound pattern. The reason is simple: in the written line we see at a glance the actual word-endings and word-beginnings, together with the punctuation, which stands (in terms of sound) for pauses. We therefore add signs to mark the notional pattern of feet as opposed to the actualities of sound. Since we do not *see* the spoken stresses, which we can only arrive at by speaking or reading the words, we add signs to mark these stresses. The notional stresses are already implied by the foot-divisions, since we begin by stating (naming) the metre in use—rising or falling rhythm, &c.

By this double device—a notation part notional, part actual—we see clearly the way in which the spoken stresses are varied against the basic stress pattern, and how the endings and beginnings of words, and the pauses, are varied against the pattern of paired syllables (or feet), and the line unit. (It is worth remarking that any notation for the actual sound patterns alone falls short of the notation of scansion precisely in omitting to show the notional pattern against which the lines are counterpointed.)

The notional foot has a strong effect on our minds. A sentence that ends on the first syllable of the line has an enormous effect, first because the sentence is counterpointed against the line unit, and secondly because the pause is counterpointed against the foot unit. A full stop in the middle of a foot gives a slight, if delightful, shock. But these effects depend upon our understanding our prosody: if there are no feet, there is no counterpointing against feet.

It remains to show how the denial of a disyllabic basis affects the reading of certain lines. Take the line from Donne:

Both the year's and the day's deep midnight is.

Sir Herbert Grierson quotes the line (in his Introduction to *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century*) with the following marking:

Both the year's | and the day's | deep mid|night is.

But Donne's stanza pattern in this poem demands here the ten-syllabled

¹ A notation for the actual sound patterns of verse has been developed in America: see Harold Whitehall and others, 'English verse and what it sounds like', *Kenyon Review*, xviii (1956), 411-77.

disyllabic line, the line of five feet. The line should therefore be read in one of the two following ways:

- (a) Both the | year's and | the day's | deep mid|night is.
 (b) Both the | year's and | the day's | deep mid|night is.

'Both' will naturally carry a stress, since it emphasizes the point that Donne is making: this is *two* midnights. The stress on 'and', suggested in (b), would be equally natural, and particularly characteristic of Donne, who delights in stressing the short, apparently unimportant, words (*to's* and *from's*, *out's* and *in's*, *her's* and *me's*), where they are logically opposed, or, as here, logically confirm each other.

Sir Herbert Grierson's marking of the line seems to miss these points of emphasis and to do so because it inclines to the view of prosody that denies the existence of feet, and so deprives the line of any constant rhythmic base. Donne's verse, however daringly modulated, does follow a fixed notional pattern of foot and stress. Thus the first line of *Twickenham Gardens* might seem at first sight to be a four-foot line:

Blasted with | sighs and sur|rounded with | tears

But if it is to fit the stanza pattern it is a line of five feet, to be read with a slight dwelling on (not stressing) the syllables *and sur-*:

Blasted | with sighs | and sur|rounded | with tears

just as the syllables *to the* need to be slightly dwelt on in Milton's

Burnt af|ter them | to the | bottom|less pit.

Whether we read these lines with fivefold or with fourfold division, the stresses are not twisted from their natural order; but if a line can be fitted into one metrical pattern or another, it is surely strange to give it that in which the poet was not writing.

II. The Rules

- A. 'The tenth syllable must always have, or be capable of being given, a stress.'

The point at issue here depends in part on what is meant by stress. Lines ending in words like *amity*, *modesty*, *misery*, *visible*, are familiar enough. The words 'or be capable of being given' may be intended to cover such cases. Yet how much stress can we in fact give them? Rather less than secondary at the most: compare *amity* with *controversy*. The pattern of rising rhythm, however, is preserved, since the tenth syllable has more stress than the ninth. The rule is not broken, provided that by

'stress' we do not mean primary stress. Yet we should assume, unless told the contrary, that full stress was intended. And is the rule worth formulating, if we may have primary stresses where we choose, with only a secondary stress at the point where the rule demands stress?

More important are the cases where the basic pattern is varied in the last two syllables; where, that is, the rhythm is not rising but level or even falling. The following lines are offered for consideration as showing stresses of this kind, if read according to the sense (logical or rhetorical). If I classify them according to my own feeling, the reader is free to make his own adjustments.

From Milton: (a) With level stress (at least) in the last foot.

So speaking, and so threat'ning, grew tenfold (P.L., ii. 705)

Wholesome and cool and mild, but with black air (P.L., x. 847)

Proceeded by oppression and sword-law (P.L., xi. 672)

(b) With falling stress in the last foot.

Exposed a matron, to prevent worse rape (P.L., i. 505)

More glorious and more dread than from no fall (P.L., ii. 16)

and unmake

For him, what for thy glory thou hast made. (P.L., iii. 163)

In all these lines there is a strong stress on the tenth syllable, even where there is falling rhythm. We do not often find in Milton both a weakly stressed tenth syllable and falling rhythm—a very bold variation. There are, however, the three lines that Bridges judged most resistant to a stress on the final syllable:

Beyond all past example and future (P.L., x. 840)

Which of us who beholds the bright surface (P.L., vi. 472)

Of thrones and mighty seraphim prostrate (P.L., vi. 841)

Milton, for one thing, was writing in a genre where decorum is at its height. We shall find a more frequent audacity of variation in Donne.

From Donne: The first five examples seem most free of stress on the final syllable.

Our greatest King call thee to his presence (El. xvi, 46)

How fresh our love was in the beginning (El. xii, 78)

But I am by her death, which word wrongs her (St. Lucy's Day, 28)

- They were Love's graves; for else he is nowhere (*El.* ix, 14)
 Go, and if that word have not quite killed thee (*The Expiration*, 7)
 It would not form one thought dark as mine are (*El.* xii, 8)
 The winter I'll not think on, to spite thee (*El.* xii, 81)
 Tells me from you that now it is bedtime (*El.* xix, 10)
 From us, and our cares; but, now 'tis not so (*Lecture upon the Shadow*, 11)
 Should I tell what a miracle she was (*The Relique*, 33)

B. 'One other stress must fall, in any one line, on either the fourth or the sixth syllable.'

Here again the force of the examples will depend on our reading the lines with the emphasis demanded by the full sense of the passage. Lines from Milton are given in modern spelling, but in no case does Milton's own spelling, as shown in Miss Darbishire's edition of *Paradise Lost*, go against the stressing suggested here.

To state as precisely as possible what is in question: not, in every case, that there is no stress on either the fourth or sixth syllable, though that is sometimes true; but rather that, if the stress on the third or fifth syllable is stronger than that on the fourth or sixth, it is a more useful observation to note that here we have a deliberate use of falling rhythm than to cling to the fact that after all there is some stress on the fourth or sixth syllable.

From Milton: (a) no stress (i.e. at the most a weak secondary) in the desired positions in second and third feet:

- Prudent, | lest from | his re|solu|tion raised,
 Others | among | the chief | might of|fer now (*P.L.*, ii. 468-9)
 (logical opposition of 'his' and 'others')
 Uni|ted as | one in|divid|ual soul (*P.L.*, v. 610)
 In mu|tiny | had from | her ax|le torn (*P.L.*, ii. 926)
 Heaven's fu|gitives, | and for | their dwel|ling place (*P.L.*, ii. 57)

(b) stress on the sixth syllable, stronger stress on the fifth:

- The mind | is its | own place, | and in | itself (*P.L.*, i. 254)
 His own | works and | their works | at once | to view (*P.L.*, iii. 59)
 He lights|, if it | were land |, that e|ver burnt (*P.L.*, i. 228)

or stress on the fourth, stronger stress on the third:

Those other two equalled with me in fate,

So were | ^{''}I e|qualled with | ^{''}them in | ^{''}renown (*P.L.*, iii. 34)

From Donne: (a) no stress on the fourth or sixth syllable:

By all | ^{''}pains which | ^{''}want and | ^{''}divorce|ment hath (*El.* xvi, 8)

To be | ^{''}staïd in | ^{''}then when | ^{''}she was | in it (*Second Anniversary*, 74)

Knowst thou | how thy | ^{''}lungs have | ^{''}attract|ed it? (*ibid.*, 274)

Return | ^{''}not, my | ^{''}Soul, from | ^{''}this ec|stasy (*ibid.*, 321)

(b) Stress on the fourth or sixth, stronger stress on the third or fifth:

Once, and | ^{''}but once | ^{''}found in | ^{''}thy com|pany (*El.* iv, 1)

To love | ^{''}there where | ^{''}no love | ^{''}received | can be (*The Will*, 17)

His soul | ^{''}out of | ^{''}one hell | into | a new (*El.* i, 8)

This hour | ^{''}her Vi|gil and | ^{''}her Eve, | since this (*St. Lucy's Day*, 44)

From Chaucer: In spite of the difficulties involved in any discussion of Chaucer's prosody, it is worth considering how to read the following lines:

By his | ^{''}clennesse | ^{''}how that | ^{''}his sheep | sholde live (*C.T.*, A. 506)

That bet | ^{''}were it | ^{''}I with | ^{''}myn hond|es tweyne (*T. & C.*, v. 1271)

A fair | ^{''}woman, | ^{''}but she | ^{''}be chaste | also (*C.T.*, D. 784)

Allas, | ^{''}Scogan, | ^{''}this is | ^{''}for thyn | offence (*To Scogan*, 13)

Unthank | ^{''}come on | ^{''}his hand | ^{''}that bond | him so (*C.T.*, A. 4082)

The proffered scansion may be wrong: but is there anything against these rhythms but an unfamiliarity which may be due to our refusal to allow them when we meet them?

To sum up the argument:

Bembo's rules seem to have been intended to preserve the pattern of disyllabic rising rhythm. It is a mistake to think them necessary in English verse. The rhythm is perfectly preserved by two or three feet in rising rhythm at any points in the line, and a pleasing variation is provided by a line with falling rhythm in precisely the syllables 3, 4, 5, 6:

That bet were it ^{''}I with myn hondes tweyne

By all ^{''}pains which ^{''}want and divorcement hath

Prudent, lest from ^{''}his resolution raised.

Further, the rules will only fulfil their purpose if there really is rising rhythm at the appointed places. In the practice of Milton and Donne, even where there is stress on the appointed syllables, the rules are often in effect by-passed, since a falling rhythm is produced of the type " ' , or ' ' .

In these cases, the rhythm is preserved without help from the nominal keeping of the rules. It follows that while the principle of varying a base is fundamental to our verse, we neither need nor observe any rule for the placing of stresses at fixed points in the line.

NOTE 1. If Bembo's rules were offered as a practical observation of what *for the most part* happens, or as practical advice as to what seems, *for the most part*, the wise procedure, there might be no need to object to them. But the qualification should be made. A theory should fit the facts.

NOTE 2. I have noted a number of Italian hendecasyllabic lines which seem, to an English ear, to show a possible lack of stress on both the fourth and the sixth syllables. That is a question for Italian scholars. For those interested, the line quoted earlier in this article will serve as an example:

Poscia vid' io mille visi cagnazzi

where, in the context, there seems no reason to stress 'io'.

Professor Prince writes:

I am grateful to the Editors for letting me see Mrs. Whiteley's article and for giving me the opportunity to reply; and I am grateful to the article itself for convincing me that my observations on Milton's prosody must be modified. Mrs. Whiteley is not the first friendly critic who has objected to my refusal to entertain the notion of 'feet', or to specify that Milton's blank-verse line must be in 'predominantly rising rhythm'. These two conceptions usually go together, for a 'predominantly rising rhythm' implies alternately unstressed and stressed syllables, and these pairs of syllables are almost inevitably regarded as 'feet'.

The effect of Mrs. Whiteley's arguments (which I cannot accept in every detail) is to convince me that the notion of a basic rhythmic pattern is indeed an essential factor in our experience of Milton's verse, and of all verse in this measure from Spenser to Yeats. Conviction comes, to my mind, when we consider Sir Herbert Grierson's notation of Donne's line:

Both the year's | and the day's | deep mid|night is.

It is impossible here to obtain the right dragging and lingering modulations if we do not read off the line against a notional 'base'; without such a base the 'modulations' cannot, indeed, *be* modulations, and the line takes on a merely lumbering jaunty movement.

It seems to me now, therefore, that I should add as a prime element of

any definition of Milton's blank verse that 'every line is to be measured against a notional basic line of ten syllables alternately unstressed and stressed'. The other requirements I had put forward, including the 'principle' expressed by Bembo—whether or not we regard this as a mere rule of thumb or practical observation—could be adapted to this.

I would add that 'a basic line of ten syllables alternately unstressed and stressed' is certainly not to be taken as a reflection of the underlying rhythmic *structure* of Milton's verse, which is better indicated by Bembo's requirement. This implies that the whole line results from the combination (in balance, unbalance, or fusion) of two unequal or asymmetrical 'halves'. These varying combinations give the English ten-syllable verse its vitality. Not only readers but poets have often, however, accepted 'ten syllables alternately unstressed and stressed' as a sufficient account; and the rhetorical weakness which Gerard Hopkins noted in much English verse sometimes comes from this facile view. On the other hand, English poets whose verbal sensibility is acute have tried experiments in diction or stress or 'elision' or 'sprung rhythm', feeling the tendency of the line to droop and drag. Not all these experiments, of course, are relevant to the solutions adopted by Milton. Donne's experiments, so freely brought into the discussion by Mrs. Whiteley, should be considered within their own context, not as evidence for a possible interpretation of Milton's rhythms. Donne never wrote a line of blank verse (as far as we know), and his 'not keeping of accent' would have been less feasible without his habitual use of rhyme. One of the lessons of my study of Milton, as I see it myself, is that we should study all the formal factors together—diction, stress, rhyme, and 'elision' all mutually affect one another. Thus dramatic blank verse should not be brought into the discussion of epic or 'meditative' blank verse because the dialogue form is itself a prosodic factor which must be taken into account and alters the possibilities open to the poet.

NOTES

'LEFUNG O SWEFNE · O NORE'

MISS RUSSELL-SMITH's note on *ridiculosae sternutationes* (*R.E.S.*, N.S. viii (1957), 266-9) amply confirms—if confirmation were needed—Mr. Smithers's interpretation of the phrase *o nore* in the Corpus and Caius MSS. of *Ancrene Wisse*. But none of the quotations yet adduced provide as close a parallel to the sentence in which this phrase occurs as does a late thirteenth-century fragment, now part of MS. Royal 13 A VII, the relevant section of which, headed 'De Sortilegis', was printed by Thomas Wright on pp. xxix-xxxiv of his edition of *The Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler* (Camden Society, 24 (1843)). In *Ancrene Wisse* the warning is against 'sygaldren · false teolunges · lefunge o swefne · o nore · ant on alle wicche-creftes': In the Royal fragment—evidently part of a penitential homiletic handbook—references to witchcraft, necromancy, and auguries are followed by the sentence:

Item, fit divinatio sternutationibus, sompniis, et sortibus quas falso dicunt apostolorum, et vana inspectione psalterii [&c.]. (p. xxx)

Here dreams and sneezes are linked exactly as in the vernacular text; whilst the allusions to *sortes* and *auguria* recall the corresponding passage in the Latin version of the *Riwele*: *ad hoc pertinent sortilegia* [&c.] (p. 74 of Miss D'Evelyn's edition, E.E.T.S. 216 (1941)).

The rest of the extract from the Royal MS. bears a strong resemblance to the chapter on *Sortilegia* in Bromyard's fourteenth-century *Summa Predicantium*, which likewise condemns belief in sneezings (edition of 1586, p. 370); Miss Russell-Smith's conjecture that references to this belief 'may have been commonplace in medieval literature' is thus well supported. But the resemblance is largely due to the fact that both works rely heavily on the Decretals at this point. Indeed, much of the Royal fragment—though not the sentence cited above—is copied word for word from *Decreti Secunda Pars*, c. xxvi; a fact that escaped Wright's notice.¹ Higden likewise

¹ The cryptic references in roman numerals that appear throughout the fragment are to chapters in the Decretals. Thus 'Ag. xxij q. iiij igitur genus et q. v. nec mirum, et in c. episcopi', at the end of the first paragraph on divination, refers to Decretum II, c. xxvii, qq. iii and iv, a quotation from Augustine (*immo Rabanus*), *De Natura Demonum*, which begins 'Igitur genus', 'nec mirum' being the incipit of c. xiv in the modern text, and 'episcopi' of c. xii. 'c. Acquiren' (p. xxxiii) is a reference to a decree of the Council of Ancyra cited in q. v, c. xii; &c. Bromyard gives similar references, e.g. at p. 371 of the Venice edition of the *Summa* (1586). The other sections of the fragment (headed 'de feriis', 'de emunitate ecclesiae', &c.) appear likewise to be closely related to the Decretals.

condemns the superstition in his (unprinted) *Speculum Curatorum*, as Professor Owst has noticed in a recent essay which everyone concerned with English folk-lore will in future have to consult.¹

J. A. W. BENNETT

CHAPMAN'S USE OF NORTH'S PLUTARCH IN *CAESAR AND POMPEY*

It has long been recognized that the sources of Chapman's only Roman play were three of Plutarch's *Lives*, the *Caesar*, the *Pompey*, and the *Cato Minor*. No one, so far as I know, has ever expressly contravened Adolf Kern's view, expounded in 1901: 'Dass Chapman . . . Plutarch's Viten nicht aus der North'schen Übersetzung, wie Shakespeare, kennen lernte, sondern direkt nach dem Original arbeitete, ist wohl als sicher anzunehmen.'² It is simple enough to modify this statement in the light of Schoell's clear proof that Chapman in this play, and elsewhere, used not Plutarch's Greek *Moralia* but Xylander's Latin translation of it: the 'Original', it may safely be inferred, would, when it is a question of the *Lives*, have been a Latin version too, though, of course, one that had the Greek running by its side for Chapman to glance at occasionally. The obvious candidate is the version of Hermannus Crusierus, first published in 1564. Crüser and Xylander each independently translated the whole of Plutarch; but, while it was Xylander's version of the *Moralia* that proved the more popular, Crüser's version of the *Lives* was preferred to that of his rival.³ Such at least may be inferred from the fact that there were several Graeco-Latin editions which used Crüser for the *Lives* and Xylander for the *Moralia*.

But even the inference that Chapman's *Lives of Plutarch* meant Crüser needs to be modified. I shall try to show that, though Chapman may well have consulted a Graeco-Latin text of the *Lives*, the probability is that he, after all, relied considerably on the humble vernacular of Sir Thomas North. In what follows I quote from Crüser's Latin (as it is found in the first volume of the Elsevir Graeco-Latin Crüser-Xylander Plutarch published at Lyons, 1655), from the Temple Classics edition of North's translation of the relevant lives (in volumes vi and vii, London, 1899), and from

¹ *Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 272-303. For the reference in Higden see p. 280.

² A. Kern, *George Chapman's Tragödie 'Caesar und Pompey' und ihre Quellen* (Halle, 1901), p. 7.

³ F. L. Schoell, *Études sur l'humanisme continental en Angleterre* (Paris, 1926), pp. 64-65, 219-22.

Parrott's edition of the play in *The Tragedies of George Chapman* (London, 1910). In each of the cases cited Crüser's Latin accurately renders Plutarch; the departures where they occur are those of North.

There is a pointer with which to begin in the fact that in Plutarch's description of the complicated behaviour of the seas and winds, which Chapman uses in Caesar's soliloquy in II. v. 24-35, Crüser correctly rendered Plutarch's τὴν ἑωθινὴν αὔραν as *matutinam auram* (726B), while both Chapman (II. v. 32) and North (vii. 171) use the phrase 'land wind', which has no real counterpart in the other versions; similarly, a few pages later we find both North (vii. 178-9) and Chapman (III. ii. 106) using the word 'battle' (i.e. battalion) to render what in Crüser is *acies* (728E, F; 729A) and in Plutarch κέρασ (*Caesar*, ch. xlv in the Loeb edition). A third example from the *Caesar* seems to me quite conclusive. The syntactical forms and the rhyme in Chapman's lines at II. iv. 19—

For finding now our army amply stor'd
With all things fit to tarry surer time,
Reason thought better to extend to length
The war betwixt us, that his little strength
May by degrees prove none—

plainly derive from North's 'For finding himself well provided of all things necessary to tarry time, he thought it better to draw this war out in length, by tract of time, the rather to consume this little strength that remained in Caesar's army' (vii. 174-5) and not from Crüser's 'Nam ipse quidem Pompeius Martis aleam iacere tantis de rebus dubitabat, & quod omnibus esset ad prolatandum bellum optime instructus, in animo erat ei hostium temporarium vigorem atterere & exhaurire' (727C).

My other examples are drawn from the other two Lives used by Chapman in this play. In each case there are clear grounds for supposing that the significant debt is to North and not to Crüser.

- (i) The Consuls both are fled, without one rite
 Of sacrifice submitted to the gods,
 As ever heretofore their custom was
 When they began the bloody frights of war. (II. ii. 8)

Crüser, *Pompeius*, 652B: 'Consules non mactatis solennibus ante bellum victimis fugere.'

North, vi. 309: 'Then the two Consuls fled also, without doing any sacrifice to the gods, as they were wont to do before they went to make any wars.'

- (ii) Hang out of my tent
 My crimson coat-of-arms . . . (III. ii. 97)

Crüser, *Pompeius*, 655E: '[Caesar] iussit confestim sagum purpureum pro praetorio proponi. . . .'

North, vi. 318-19: 'and thereupon gave order presently that they should put out the red coat of arms upon his tent. . . .'

- (iii) I cannot, sir, abide men's open mouths,
Nor be ill spoken of; . . . (IV. i. 45)

Crüser, *Pompeius*, 655A: 'His et huiusmodi multis dictis virum impotentem gloriae & ruboris erga amicos impulerunt Pompeium, ut relictis consiliis optimis suis, ipsorum obsecundaret spei & motibus . . .'

North, vi. 316-17: 'With these and many such other lewd speeches, they compelled Pompey in the end (who could not abide to be ill spoken of, and would not deny his friends anything) to follow their vain hope and desires, and to forsake his own wise determination.'

- (iv) . . . their tents
Strow'd all with flowers and nosegays, tables cover'd
With cups and banquets, bays and myrtle garlands . . . (IV. iii. 10)

Crüser, *Pompeius*, 657E: 'Siquidem tabernacula erant myrto omnia re-darata & stragulis pictis exornata: instructae poculis mensae & crateres vini expositi . . .'

North, vi. 324: 'For, all their tents and pavilions were full of nosegays and garlands of myrtle, and their couches all covered with flowers, their tables full of bowls of wine . . .'

- (v) Portius *kneeling* (S.D. at v. ii. 59)

Crüser, *Cato Minor*, 792F: 'flens filius accurrit cum amicis, ruensque; in complexum eius coepit lamentari & obsecrare eum.'

North, vii. 375: 'his son and friends at length ran unto him, and falling down on their knees, lamented, and besought him . . .'

- (vi) be counsell'd
By your experienc'd father not to touch
At any action of the public weal,
Nor any rule bear near her politic stern:
For, to be upright and sincere therein
Like Cato's son, the time's corruption
Will never bear it; and, to soothe the time,
You shall do basely, and unworthy your life. . . . (v. ii. 107)

Crüser, *Cato Minor*, 792A: 'tum filio ne attingeret rempublicam interdixit, quippe eam, ut dignum esset Catone, haud integrum fore posthac capessere: alia ratione turpe esse.'

North, vii. 373: 'he charged his son in no case to meddle in the affairs of the commonwealth. For said he, to deal uprightly like Cato's son, the corruption of the time and state will not abide it: and contrarily, observing the time, thou canst not do like an honest man.'

Chapman, of course, undoubtedly possessed and used a Graeco-Latin Plutarch. What we are often presented with is a process of conflation (compare *ne attingeret rempublicam* with 'not to touch | At any action of the public weal' in the last example) rather than the consistent use of either the English or the Latin version. But it is high time that formal and explicit recognition was accorded to the contribution made by Sir Thomas North to many of Chapman's turns of phrase and idea. We should by now find nothing surprising in the spectacle of a Renaissance poet, even one with considerable and well-justified claims to classical learning, carrying away his spoils by the back door of the vernacular translation as well as by the royal road of the *ipsissima verba*.

PETER URE

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON RELIGION

SWIFT'S RELATIONSHIP TO FILMER AND LOCKE

It has not, I believe, been noticed before that Swift's fragment, *Further Thoughts on Religion*, is a refutation of Sir Robert Filmer's statement of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings in *Patriarcha*, and that it follows lines previously laid down by Locke. Filmer's *Patriarcha, or the Natural Power of Kings*, written during the Civil War, was posthumously published, at a time when Parliamentary opposition was once more gaining strength and voice against the despotic government of Charles II. Filmer set out to prove that monarchy was the form of government instituted by God for the ordering of the world; that, further, in England this had been achieved in practice as well as in theory, all early kings having possessed absolute power; and that any resistance to monarchical authority was both sinful and seditious.

Filmer claimed the unquestioned authority of Genesis in his support, and took the appeal to precedent to its logical extreme when he attempted to vindicate royalist absolutism by reference to the dominion over his wife supposedly granted to Adam by God. 'And indeed,' he wrote, 'not only Adam but the succeeding Patriarchs had, by Right of Fatherhood, Royal Authority over their Children' (*Patriarcha* (1680 edn.), p. 12). This sovereignty, which extended also over the whole world, 'was as large and as ample as the Absolutist Dominion of any Monarch which hath been since the Creation' (p. 13). Adam passed on his authority to his heirs by

'the Ancient and Prime Right of Lineal Succession to Paternal Government' (p. 18), thus guaranteeing the absolute power of all modern monarchs; for, said Filmer, 'they all either are or are to be reputed the next Heirs to those first progenitors, who were at first the Natural Parents of the whole People, and in their Right succeed to the Exercise of Supreme Jurisdiction' (p. 19).

Filmer's most famous opponent, of course, was John Locke. Locke's refutation, in *Two Treatises on Government* (1690), dealt not only with *Patriarcha* but also with Filmer's *Observations concerning the Original of Government*, published in 1652 and reprinted in 1680. The whole of the *First Treatise* was devoted to answering these two books. The first argument Locke attacked was that contained in the *Observations*—but not in *Patriarcha* except by implication—asserting Adam's dominion over Eve. He contended that parental authority over descendants was given to Eve as much as to Adam, and that Adam's authority over his wife was that of a husband only. Of the two biblical texts on which Filmer's case was based, he concluded,

one . . . signified only the Subjection of the inferior Ranks of Creatures to Mankind, and the other, the Subjection that is due from a Wife to her Husband, both far enough from that which Subjects owe to the Governors of Political Societies.¹

That Swift was also among those who opposed Filmer is not surprising. We should expect him to have little sympathy with the doctrines of *Patriarcha* from what we know of his political and historical ideas in *Contests and Dissensions*, as well as from the more familiar references to Filmer in his later works.² But the brief rebuttal of Filmer's biblical arguments contained in *Further Thoughts on Religion*³ is of particular interest because it is the only refutation of Swift's that considers the actual terms of Filmer's case. In this work, Swift conceded that Christians were obliged to believe the account of the creation given in Genesis, but asserted that Adam was granted no regal authority. In fact, he said, 'the text mentioneth nothing of his Maker's intending him for except to rule over the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air'.⁴ Adam's sovereignty over Eve was expressly rejected in the next sentence, implying that Swift drew his refutation from Locke, as Eve is not mentioned in *Patriarcha*: 'As to Eve, it does not appear that her husband was her monarch, only she was to be his help-meet and placed in some degree of subjection. . . .' After an intervening two sen-

¹ *Two Treatises* (1690 edn.), p. 63.

² See *Sentiments of a Church of England Man*, in *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, D.D., ed. Temple Scott (hereafter *Works*), xi. 376, and *Drapier's Letters*, *Works*, vi. 175.

³ First published in Faulkner's quarto edition of 1765. The passage is not dated; it was probably written during Swift's time at Moor Park, as there would have been less incentive to write it after the turn of the century.

⁴ *Works*, iii. 310.

tences concerning the effects of the Fall on Adam's regiment over the beasts, the argument concludes by pointing out that no instance of Adam's exercising monarchical power is recorded in the Bible: 'The Scripture mentioneth no particular acts of royalty in Adam over his posterity who were contemporary with him, or of any monarch until after the Flood.'

Not the least remarkable fact about this statement of Swift's is the close resemblance it bears to Locke's argument in the *First Treatise*. So close, indeed, is the parallel that it seems to be a summary of the early chapters of Locke's book, though so expressed as to make it quite clear that it was also Swift's position. The order of his sentences follows that of Locke's refutation step by step. The fourth chapter of the *First Treatise* and Swift's second sentence deal with 'Adam's Title to Sovereignty by Donation'.¹ The next chapter and Swift's third sentence discuss 'Adam's Title to Sovereignty by the Subjection of Eve'. And Locke's sixth chapter and Swift's sixth sentence treat of 'Adam's Title to Sovereignty by Fatherhood'. It is evident that Swift was following Locke's argument and accepted his rejection of Filmer's patriarchal doctrine.

MYRDDIN JONES

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S 'STAGIRIUS' AND SAINT-MARC GIRARDIN

I OWE the discovery of an unsuspected connexion between Matthew Arnold and Saint-Marc Girardin (1801-73), French politician and minor literary critic, to an attempt to explain an odd variation in the title of one of Arnold's early poems. The verses which we know as 'Stagirius' were first published in *The Strayed Reveller* (1849) as 'Stagyryus', reprinted as 'Desire' in *Poems: Second Series* (1855), and resumed their earlier title—now for the first time with the correct spelling—in the 1877 collected edition of Arnold's poems. To that edition a short note was added:

Stagirius was a young monk to whom St. Chrysostom addressed three books, and of whom these books give an account. They will be found in the first volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Chrysostom's works.

Here the facts are accurately stated, but it would be rash to assume that St. John Chrysostom's *Ad Stagirium* was the direct source of Arnold's poem, or that Arnold ever consulted this work, since—whatever the apparent implications of his note—these matters are not positively asserted.

¹ The quotation is the title of Locke's chapter. The same method of comparison is used in the following sentences also.

Arnold's Oxford editors support caution. They say bluntly that 'there is nothing specific in the text [of the poem] to indicate any connexion with the young and melancholy monk to whom St. Chrysostom addressed himself'. They also point out the existence of an untitled manuscript of the poem signed and dated 'M. A. 1844', and from these two pieces of information they conclude plausibly that 'the lines were written with no thought of Stagirus in mind'.¹ They offer diffidently certain 'resemblances of a more general kind' between Arnold's poem and *Ad Stagirium*, but these resemblances are unconvincing. Of course, there is no reason why they should be anything else if Stagirus was not the original subject of the poem. No editors or critics throw any light on the form *Stagyryus*. There is a small problem here. If this peculiar spelling of the name is not a simple misprint—and this is a most unlikely explanation—why did Arnold adopt it in 1849?

It was reasonable in trying to answer this question to consider the kind of literary material that we know to lie behind some of Arnold's poems ('Sohrab and Rustum', 'The Church of Brou', &c.). It occurred to me that the lack of correspondence between 'Stagirus' and St. Chrysostom's homily would be less extraordinary if we could assume that Arnold had taken his information, as on other occasions, from a secondary source, and, further, that the author of this hypothetical source had drawn a parallel—whether soberly or more fancifully was immaterial—between the melancholy of Chrysostom's monk and the contemporary romantic malaise which is the real subject of Arnold's verses. If these assumptions were sound, the author of the intermediate source was writing fairly close to Arnold's own time. Two steps completed the argument. The first was to recall Arnold's busy reading of French poets, novelists, and critics between 1845 and 1850; the second was to realize that *Stagyryus* could be a careless anglicization of the French form *Stagyre*.²

If Arnold had taken his title from a French source, Sainte-Beuve was an obvious author to consult. Fortunately the *Causeries du Lundi* have a good index. The most important of several references to St. Chrysostom relates to Sainte-Beuve's first *causerie*, contributed to *Le Constitutionnel* (1 October 1849) immediately after his return to Paris from Belgium. This essay is a review of two books by Saint-Marc Girardin and it contains the following passage:

Mais surtout il [Girardin] est de ceux qui ont le plus contribué à guérir les jeunes générations de la *maladie de René*. Qu'est ce que cette maladie? M. Saint-Marc Girardin l'a définie mainte fois et combattue sous toutes les formes; il l'a ren-

¹ *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold: a Commentary* (1940), p. 51.

² This form can be found (though less frequently than *Stagire*) in the older French biographical dictionaries and works of reference.

contrée et décrite particulièrement avec une expression frappante dans un jeune homme à qui saint Jean Chrysostome en son temps adressait des conseils et qui passait pour possédé du démon, dans le jeune *Stagyre*, premier type reconnaissable de cette famille des René et des Werther. M. Saint-Marc Girardin a comme découvert ce *Stagyre*, et il lui adresse à son tour beaucoup de vérités que la politesse l'empêchait alors de dire en face à René lui-même. Le démon de *Stagyre*, ou, ce qui revient au même, le mal de René, c'est le dégoût de la vie, l'inaction et l'abus du rêve, un sentiment orgueilleux d'isolement, de se croire méconnu, de mépriser le monde et les voies tracées, de les juger indignes de soi, de s'estimer le plus désolé des hommes, et à la fois d'aimer sa tristesse; le dernier terme de ce mal serait le suicide.¹

Sainte-Beuve also notices Girardin's cure for the romantic malady:

Ne vous croyez pas supérieur aux autres; acceptez la vie commune; ne faites pas fi de la petite morale, elle est la seule bonne. Le démon de *Stagyre*, c'est la tristesse ou plutôt le défaut d'énergie et de ressort, c'est le néant de l'âme. Pour en sortir, préférez à tous les plaisirs des mœurs régulières et simples, des devoirs et des intérêts de tous les jours. Prenez un état, mariez-vous, ayez des enfants. . .

Here was virtually everything I wanted, but the date of Sainte-Beuve's review should be noted. Since *The Strayed Reveller* appeared in the early spring of 1849 and must have been prepared for publication in 1848, Sainte-Beuve cannot have been the source of Arnold's knowledge of *Stagyris* or of Girardin, and the extracts quoted merely indicate that he, like Arnold, had been struck by the parallel drawn between the sensibility of a fourth-century monk and that of a romantic *échevelé* in their own day.

Arnold's independent knowledge of Saint-Marc Girardin is not surprising in view of the amount of French literature he read in his youth, his addiction to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and the close attention that he—with such friends as Clough and Stanley—gave to French politics in 1848. Girardin is hardly a name now even to specialists in Victorian literature, but he was a person of some consequence in his time, a professor of history and subsequently of poetry at the Sorbonne, a regular contributor to the *Journal des Débats*, a member of the Academy from 1844, and a deputy of the chamber—in the eighteen-thirties and eighteen-forties—who for a brief moment in February 1848 held office as Minister of State. Conservative in politics, orthodox in religion (Orléaniste and Catholic), he was in his attitude to contemporary literature a polite but determined anti-romantic. Sainte-Beuve describes him as a moralist before anything else and rather acidly notes that even as a young man he was never betrayed into enthusiastic feeling. He had, we are told, 'l'esprit, le cœur naturellement modérés'. If he ever showed any excess, it was 'un excès de raison'. His chief

¹ *Causeries du Lundi* (4th edn.), i. 18.

published work was the *Cours de littérature dramatique* (1843-63), originally given as lectures at the Sorbonne.¹

Girardin's account of Stagirus is to be found in the fifth chapter of the first volume of his *Cours*, where he argues that there is a peculiar type of suicide, primarily caused by 'la faiblesse et l'impotence des âmes', which is 'le mal particulier de notre époque'. This type of suicide, which is illustrated from *Werther* and Alfred de Vigny's *Chatterton* after some consideration of 'le goût de la mort et le doute de l'avenir' in *Hamlet* (chapters vi and vii), was quite unknown in classical times. It might seem to be the expression of an exclusively modern kind of sensibility, Girardin admits, but he does not think that it is so:

Non: il y a eu une littérature qui a exprimé l'état de malaise et d'inquiétude que nous ressentons, et qui a peint le monde se consumant de tristesses au milieu des joies les plus étourdissantes, et cherchant aussi dans le suicide un terme plutôt qu'un remède à ses maux. Cette littérature est la littérature des Pères de l'Eglise. (i. 105-6)

As an example of romantic sensibility he chooses from this literature Chryso- stom's pupil 'Stagyre, qui était possédé du démon'. The demon is 'de-mythologized' in the following quotation:

Mais ne nous en tenons pas au dehors des choses, voyons quel est le démon qui possède Stagyre: c'est la tristesse, ou plutôt c'est l'*athumia*, car le mot grec est plus expressif mille fois que le mot français; c'est le défaut d'énergie et de ressort, c'est l'abattement, ou, pour traduire d'une manière exacte, c'est le néant de l'âme. Voilà le démon de Stagyre. (p. 106)

Girardin now sketches a character of Stagirus. He is one of those sick and restless souls who believe that they belong to the elect because they are lacking in 'la force des âmes vulgaires'.² To rid himself of his unrest he enters a monastery, but fails to discover in the religious life 'cette paix et cette gaieté qu'il cherchait partout'—inevitably, because at first a man finds in solitude only what he takes with him. What most afflicts Stagirus is that he has renounced a life of pleasure for solitary austerities and still remains melancholy and discontented, while other reformed pleasure-seekers have found happiness in marriage and parenthood. Girardin underlines the moral with a heavy hand.

La tristesse perçait, comme un ver rongeur, les plaisirs et les joies du monde romain; et il n'y avait de secours contre le démon de Stagyre ni dans les belles esclaves et leurs danses ioniennes, ni dans les repas magnifiques . . . L'*athumia*

¹ It was the first two volumes of this work, together with the two volumes of *Essais de littérature et de morale*, that Sainte-Beuve was reviewing in 1849. The remarks quoted are from the same review.

² 'I too have long'd for trenchant force | And will like a dividing spear. . . ' Arnold, 'A Farewell' (1852).

empoisonnait tout cela, et le démon possédait tous ces débauchés au sein même de leurs débauches. Mais si, fatigués de ces plaisirs et de ces angoisses, ils prenaient des mœurs régulières et simples, s'ils se mariaient et avaient des enfants, alors, et comme par enchantement, le démon s'éloignait. La vie de famille et sa paisible douceur faisaient fuir les inquiétudes et les malaises. (p. 108)

This sequence reminds one of Sainte-Beuve's attempt to describe the course of Arnold's development:

... c'était un Français et un peu romantique égaré là-bas. C'était piquant chez le fils du respectable Arnold [Dr. Arnold]. ... Depuis il s'est marié, s'est réglé, et, dans ses poésies, il reste fidèle au culte des anciens et de l'art.¹

Girardin also quotes with approval Chrysostom's censure of any indulgence of melancholy, and again this may remind us of Arnold, who was equally severe to the same fault.

'Le meilleur moyen de se délivrer de la tristesse, c'est de ne point l'aimer.' Mot profond et dont nous sentons aujourd'hui la justesse. Combien, parmi les héros de nos romans et dans le monde même, combien sommes-nous qui aimons notre tristesse, que nous décorons du nom de mélancolie, et qui l'entretenons amoureusement dans notre cœur! (p. 111)

Compare Arnold's comment in a letter of April 1856 to his sister 'K' (Mrs. W. E. Forster):

To make a habitual war on depression and low spirits, which in one's early youth one is apt to indulge and be somewhat interested in, is one of the things one learns as one gets older. They are noxious alike to body and mind, and already partake of the nature of death.²

The bearing of Girardin's lecture on Arnold's poem should now be clear. The untitled verses of 1844 appear to be strictly personal—an exploration of romantic weaknesses which Arnold discovered in himself. At a later date, probably when he was making ready *The Strayed Reveller* for the press in 1848, the title 'Stagyrus' was added in order to suggest that the poem was merely a dramatic lyric, the representation of an interesting state of mind. Arnold's repudiation of an autobiographical element in *Empedocles on Etna* may be remembered. In both cases his evasiveness can be justified if we realize that Stagyrus and Empedocles do not represent the whole of Arnold, but rather aspects of his nature with which other equally important aspects were perpetually at war.

The case is already a strong one for Arnold's familiarity with the first volume of Girardin's *Cours de littérature dramatique* and for his having

¹ Letter (27 October 1860) to Madame de Solms. Quoted by L. Bonnerot, *Matthew Arnold: Poète* (Paris, 1947), pp. 530-1.

² *Letters of Matthew Arnold*, ed. G. W. E. Russell (London, 1895), i. 52.

entitled his 1844 verses 'Stagyryus' in 1848, but there is independent evidence which both supports and improves on these conclusions. The following sentence occurs in a letter from Arnold to Clough (1 March 1848):

I received yours just now as I was beginning to drop into a slight doze over the works and days of the respectable Hesiod: a result however I attribute not so much to that writer, as to one St. Marc Girardin, a lecture of whom upon 'le Caractère du Père dans la Comédie'—I had just previously closed, one of my painfulest follies being the itch to read thro: a work whereof I need a small part.¹

Arnold's 'le Caractère du Père dans la Comédie' is a conflation of parts of two chapter-headings in the first volume of the *Cours de littérature dramatique*—'Du caractère paternel dans la comédie' (chap. xii) and 'Des pères dans la comédie' (chap. xiii), and it is highly probable that the 'small part' of the book needed was the discussion of 'le jeune Stagyre'. We know, then, that Arnold was reading Girardin on 1 March 1848 for a particular purpose, and it is only mildly speculative to suppose that 'Stagyryus' received its title about that time. If one can reconstruct the whole course of events, it would seem that Arnold found a reference to Girardin's book in some French review²—a reference describing 'Stagyre' as an anticipatory René—shortly before his letter to Clough; and that in preparing his verses for publication he remembered this reference and obtained the book to make certain that Girardin had said what had been attributed to him by a reviewer.

There is an interesting sequel to Arnold's remark that in accordance with one of his 'painfulest follies' he read more of Girardin than he needed. He mentions that he reached either chapter xii or chapter xiii, but he does not record that his eye must have caught the heading to chapter xv and that either then or later he read this chapter in full. Girardin's heading for chapter xv is: 'De l'amour maternel. — Mérope dans Torelli, Maffei, Voltaire et Alfieri' (i. 357).

Arnold's verse-play *Merope* (1858), which celebrated with rather wooden dignity his election to the Chair of Poetry at Oxford, is prefaced by a long critical essay. This essay mentions Torelli and discusses in detail the treatment of Merope as a tragic subject by Maffei, Voltaire, and Alfieri. Even Arnold's description—which W. P. Ker found mirth-provoking—of the 'great stock' of excellent tragic subjects in Hyginus, 'the Latin mythographer of uncertain date', can be matched in Girardin, who refers to 'le mythologue Hygin' and notices that 'les fables mythologiques d'Hygin sont, pour la plupart, des arguments d'anciennes tragédies grecques'

¹ *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to A. H. Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry (London, 1932), p. 68.

² I have not looked for this reference. It is possible that Arnold first heard of Girardin's book in conversation.

(pp. 357-8). It must be said at once that Girardin's lecture is a duller and much slighter piece of work than Arnold's essay, and that many things in Arnold—for example, his general discussion of the Greek tragic form—have no kind of counterpart in Girardin. Yet, when this has been said, it is still true that Arnold is indebted to the French critic for much of his method and some of his learning, and it is remarkable that he should have made no acknowledgement of what he appropriated. The excuses that Arnold finds elsewhere for reserve about his sources hardly seem applicable here.

KENNETH ALLOTT

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*

Sir,

While I am grateful to Mr. J. B. Leishman for his valuable and exhaustive examination of Volumes II and VII of *The Sermons of John Donne* (R.E.S., n.s. viii (1957), 434-43), I feel obliged to query one at least of his criticisms. He writes: 'In the Introduction to Vol. II there is much interesting information about Donne and Lincoln's Inn, although I am far from convinced by the attempt (pp. 8 ff.) to demonstrate that the sermons he preached there were peculiarly adapted to his audience. . . . In fact, the attempt to establish any close relation between particular sermons and the congregations to which they were preached seems to me unprofitable, superficial, and misleading. At all times Donne was a Christian preaching to Christians and an Anglican preaching to Anglicans, . . .'. To this I would answer that Donne would have been lacking in ordinary intelligence if he had not tried to adapt his sermons to different types of congregations. As Reader at Lincoln's Inn he preached in a small building considerably smaller even than the present chapel, which was consecrated in 1623, when Donne, then Dean of St. Paul's, came back to preach a special dedicatory sermon. His audience at Lincoln's Inn consisted entirely of men studying or practising law. During the four law terms Donne was required to preach twice every Sunday, and on the Sundays immediately before and after term he preached once. He never had the opportunity of preaching there at Christmas or Easter, because these festivals always fell in the vacation. Therefore the majority of Donne's sermons were arranged in courses designed to instruct his hearers. In an interesting passage he tells us: '... as heretofore I found it a usefull and acceptable labour, to employ our Evening exercises, upon the vindicating of some such places of Scripture, as our adversaries of the Roman Church had detorted in some point of controversie between them and us, and restoring those places to their true sense, (which course

I held constantly for one whole year) so I think it a usefull and acceptable labour, now to employ for a time those Evening exercises to reconcile some such places of Scripture, as may at first sight seem to differ from one another' (Vol. II, p. 325). This type of sermon did not conduce to great oratory, and I think it will be found that while Donne preached some good and interesting sermons at Lincoln's Inn, not one of them can be ranked among his best.

At St. Paul's he found his opportunity and he was quick to seize it. There he was required to preach on Christmas Day, Easter, and Whit Sunday, and we have also five sermons for Candlemas Day, and five for the patronal festival of St. Paul's Conversion. The Lord Mayor and the representatives of the twelve great livery companies attended on the principal festivals, and the ordinary citizens, both male and female, flocked to hear their Dean. To most of his audience it seemed that 'Golden Chrysostome was alive againe', as Richard Busby put it, and he became the most famous preacher in London. Occasionally he disappointed his hearers. I am far from suggesting that every sermon preached at St. Paul's was better than any at Lincoln's Inn, but I maintain that at St. Paul's in the series of Christmas, Easter, and Whit Sunday sermons, and also in the Prebend Sermons, Donne responded as an orator to the challenge of a large and representative audience.

I have no space to argue here that at Whitehall and at St. Dunstan's Donne also adapted himself to the special needs of each particular congregation, but the evidence can be found in the volumes of our edition. I wish that Mr. Leishman could have found room in one of his two reviews to mention the most original feature of our edition—our attempt to arrange the sermons in the order in which they were delivered. There is some merit in the arrangement of the *LXXX Sermons* of 1640, in which the sermons are classified as 'Preached at Christmas', 'Preached on Candlemas Day', 'Preached in Lent', and so on, but I can see no advantage in following the *Fifty Sermons* in printing together 'Preached at Mariages', 'Preached at Christnings', 'Preached to the Nobility', with complete disregard of chronology, or in the even worse disorder of *XXVI Sermons*. Our arrangement, which has entailed many months of hard work, enables readers to follow Donne's progress through his ministry, and to trace the workings of a mind which was both passionate and powerful in a very high degree.

EVELYN M. SIMPSON

Mr. Leishman writes:

I am grateful for this opportunity to withdraw the remark of which Mrs. Simpson complains, and which I now see was phrased in a careless and discourteous manner, only too likely to prove 'misleading'. I can but plead in my defence that I was regarding this possibility of classification, not in precise relation to the conclusions which the editors themselves had expressed, but in relation to the use that might be made of it by more inexperienced and superficial scholars. That Donne's sermons were *to some extent* influenced by the congregations to which he preached them seems to me scarcely a matter that requires to be insisted upon, nor does it seem to me that the editors have insisted upon it excessively.

My only fear is lest this and other possibilities of biographical, or semi-biographical, investigation should distract attention from the more important task of attempting to reach, in any particular sermon, the completest possible assessment of Donne's exposition of doctrine, use of authorities, and approach to perfection of form.

I should also like to take this opportunity to say that, whatever criticisms I may have ventured to make of this edition, I nevertheless consider it in many ways an excellent one, supplying a long-felt need, and reflecting great credit upon the University of California for having undertaken a service to English scholarship which our own presses have failed to perform.

Sir,

Mr. Ernest Schanzer, in his recent contribution on 'Daniel's Revision of his Cleopatra' (*R.E.S.*, N.S. viii (1957), 375-81), does me an injustice when he assumes that before writing my article in *Shakespeare Survey* (vi (1953), 91-93) I did not refer to the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonius*. I did look carefully at the Countess's version. The things which seemed to me most odd in Daniel's account, the rolls of taffeta and the pulley, Mr. Schanzer admits are not in *Antonius* and I have found no other source for them. I still think they are odd. Why did Daniel not rest content with the Garnier Pembroke statement that it was cords which Cleopatra and her maids used to draw Antony up (chains and ropes, according to Plutarch)? The business of the pulley may not by itself be quite so remarkable but it is interesting that Daniel should introduce, independently, so practical a detail.

In my article I commented on Daniel's striking reference to 'the underlookers' and Mr. Schanzer would derive the hint for this from *Antonius*; but he is not quite accurate when he says that Plutarch does not refer to these underlookers and takes this as a piece of evidence that Daniel must have been leaning on the play. Plutarch does, in fact, refer to the spectators ("They that were present to behold it said they never saw so pitiful a sight . . . but Cleopatra . . . did lift him up with much ado, and never let go her hold, with the help of the women beneath that bad her be of good courage, and were as sorry to see her labour so as she herself." *Shakespeare's Plutarch*, ed. Skeat, p. 221) and *Antonius* does not add anything noteworthy to this. The gory details which come in so vividly in *Cleopatra* are Daniel's own.

The Pembroke Garnier speech has a certain vividness, as Mr. Schanzer claims, but all its details are quite different from Daniel's. The *Antonius* passage begins with a description of Antony's appearance and mentions his beard, his face, and his breast. Daniel says merely that he was 'imbru'd with blood'. *Antonius* says he looked through half-closed eyes at the queen, held up his hands, and helped himself to rise. Daniel has nothing of this. *Antonius* then describes the appearance of Cleopatra, her eyes, her hair, her breast. This again is not in Daniel. *Antonius* tells how Cleopatra 'enlast hir in the corde' and strove with all her force to raise Antony, and how the effort cost her some physical distress. Daniel, on the other hand, explains first that Cleopatra will not allow

the doors of the monument to be opened and that she decides instead to draw Antony up in 'rowles of taffaty' to a window at the top. But at this window, according to him, are Eras and Charmion and it is they who are hoisting Antony up by means of a pulley, he meanwhile in mid-air showering out his blood on the spectators below. Then, still according to Daniel's account, the frame sticks, whereupon Cleopatra herself lends a hand. It sticks again but she renews her efforts and at last gets him in and lays him on her bed. The last part of the account in *Antonius* gives four lines to the sympathy of the crowd with Cleopatra's efforts and concludes that she kept at the task until Antony was drawn within the tomb. This comparison of the two texts does not, it seems to me, substantiate Mr. Schanzer's claim that 'A glance at the corresponding passage in *Antonius* makes clear that it was this which served as Daniel's model for the description'. It seems to suggest only that the Countess of Pembroke's is a vivid account and Daniel's is a vivid account and that they are quite different from each other.

JOAN REES

Sir,

In my review of Keynes's *Letters of William Blake*, printed in *R.E.S.*, n.s. ix (1958), 94-95, I made the important point that we now know Blake to have moved to Lambeth as early as 1791, but I unaccountably muddled the beginning of my statement of the evidence. The relevant paragraph should begin as follows:

'(1) Sir Geoffrey prints for the first time the address of Willey Reveley's note to Blake (Document 1). It is "Mr. Blake, Engraver, Hercules Buildings, Westminster Bridge". Blake's reply (Document 2) is on the back of Reveley's note, which is dated', &c.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

REVIEWS

The Development of Germanic Verse Form. By WINFRED P. LEHMANN.
Pp. xx+218. Austin: University of Texas Press and Linguistic Society of America, 1956. \$5.00.

The supposed original verse form common to all the Germanic peoples had already by the time of the earliest existing poems been changed in various ways in the various nations. From the ninth century onwards the verse form underwent a transformation in which the fundamental rhythmic bond of the poetry was changed and rhyme replaced alliteration. It is the purpose of Dr. Lehmann's book to describe this development and to study the reasons for it. In general terms the changes in the verse form are found to be correlate with, and hence caused by, changes in linguistic structure, in the kind of audience and the manner of presentation, and in 'direction of influence' (i.e. influence from poetry not Germanic). A brief attempt is also made at the beginning and end of the book to show the general validity of the conclusions reached here from the study of one particular literature.

As a discussion of all the possible influences in the development of Germanic verse as a whole, the book has some importance, but its value is reduced by faults in the execution of the plan. Perhaps the chief of these is the undue emphasis laid on the limitations language imposes on verse form; these have some effect, but the short lines of Eddic poetry, for instance, are due as much to taste as anything else, as might have been clear if the author had not virtually confined himself to 'Völundarkviða'. The Edda cannot be characterized by one poem, and if such a limitation were allowable, 'Völundarkviða' would not be the most suitable poem to use. Similarly in Old High German the introduction of rhymed verse is due above all to one man's action, but this is not always remembered in the attempt to make the linguistic background into something more than a background.

The influence of individual poets is discounted, but may easily have been very important. In the north there were Bragi, mysterious but not imaginary, and Egill Skallagrímsson, in the south there was Otfrid, and in England some of the anonymous writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were notable innovators. However little we may know of some of these, they were all conscious artists, and their deliberate contributions to the development of verse form are too lightly regarded in this book.

Dr. Lehmann believes that Skaldic verse could have arisen out of Eddic verse. He enumerates the differences between Skaldic and Eddic verse and his opinion is that, with the possible exception of rhyme, they may all be explained as regularization by the Skalds of elements in other Germanic poetry. But in view of the intimate mingling of Scandinavians and Irish, which began a reasonable length of time before the probable date of the appearance of Skaldic verse, it is difficult to see how the Skalds can have been ignorant of the forms of verse pre-

vailing in Ireland, or how, knowing them, artists so concerned with technique can have escaped influence from them. Even Dr. Lehmann (p. 192) admits the likelihood of influence in the matter of internal rhymes, and in some other respects his denial of similarity between Irish and Skaldic metres is superficial, e.g. the continued use of resolution of a long syllable does not make the Skaldic counting of syllables different in principle from that in Irish verse. But we still require exact detailed comparisons of Irish and Skaldic metres.

Not the least of the disadvantages of the book is the style of the writing; many a paragraph must be read and re-read before the author's meaning can be found, however familiar his material is. This can hardly be demonstrated in a review, but in the following sentence Dr. Lehmann, although of course he knows what the facts are, gives a description of the alliteration of consonants in Germanic verse which is just the opposite of the facts: 'The single consonants alliterated with each other—likewise the groups *sp*, *st*, *sk*—' (p. 37), and in another instance his sentence strikes a balance between two complementary arguments as if they were opposites: 'The evidence against considering the stanzaic form the more original is therefore stronger than that in favor of the form maintained in the south' (p. 31). Actual errors of fact are infrequent but not avoided altogether, e.g. 'The mutual exclusion of rime and alliteration continues in later poetry, such as Layamon's *Brut*' (p. 102), a statement that is untrue for *Pearl*, and even for *Brut*, which contains lines such as 'and alle his scipen gode: þa floten bi sæ flode' (ed. Madden, i. 1031-2), and 'Heo comen in to halle: hændeliche alle' (ii. 13981-2). Finally it must be noted that misprints and misquotations are common: three score in two hundred pages.

D. SLAY

The Golden Mirror. Studies in Chaucer's Descriptive Technique and its Literary Background. By CLAES SCHAAR. Pp. viii+526 (Skrifter udgivna av kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 54). Lund: Gleerup. 1955. Kr. 50.

A comprehensive study of Chaucer's descriptive technique could be illuminating and exciting. *The Golden Mirror* is regrettably neither. Much learning and wide (though often hasty) reading have gone to the work, but the subject is conceived on so generous a scale that precision is lost, and the methods of analysis are too crude for the nature of the subject. Dr. Schaar is seriously hampered by the difficulties of writing upon a stylistic subject in a foreign idiom, and many words upon which he relies ('abstract', 'impressionistic', 'idealising', 'drastic', 'laconic', 'epical') are used unidiomatically, or too loosely to have critical value. The broad terms in which the discussion is carried on fail to touch the finer points of Chaucer's writing.

Dr. Schaar proposes (p. 5) a study of Chaucer's poetry 'with a view to ascertaining, if possible, the affinities or the differences between his descriptive technique and that of his predecessors and his contemporaries, and to defining the points where he differs from or agrees with them'. As well as 'works which

have left direct traces' upon Chaucer's writings, he wishes to include any works which Chaucer may have read or heard about. 'We must try to cover the widest possible area in order to sketch the background against which the poet's own work stands out' (p. 12). The comparative study is in three parts: 'description of emotions', 'the portraits', 'landscape description'. The descriptive passages in each field are divided into types, each roughly defined with reference to a single example. Representation of emotion is considered, for instance, in three categories: 'emotive', in which feelings only are described; 'behaviouristic', in which actions showing emotion are described, and thirdly, a mixed type, in which both actions and feelings are described. In the 'portraits', three types of "concrete description" are distinguished and six types of 'more or less "abstract description"', and, in landscape, four descriptive types, 'different stages on a scale from the abstract to the concrete'.

It is always salutary to examine familiar material under fresh conditions, and the reader will derive instruction from following the presentation of examples from Chaucer under the various headings, and from considering the relationship of structural and descriptive types. The general conclusions arrived at, however, by counting the number of lines devoted to each type of description in Chaucer's works are those which one might have suggested in the first place: e.g. that there is more 'emotive' description in *Troilus* than in the *Canterbury Tales*, and that complex syntax is more often found in 'emotive' than 'behaviouristic' passages. Nor is it surprising that 'a real dissimilarity between the earlier and the later works . . . is found in the rare occurrence, in the former group, of description of profession and habits, as against the very extensive use of these types in the latter' (p. 248). Too much of the book is spent in opaquely stating the obvious, and too little attention is given to the relationship of descriptive passages to their context and their place in the poet's scheme. Emotion may be described in a particular way for a particular effect at a given moment (as the studied embarrassment of Diomedes, cited p. 109, is presented in 'behaviouristic' style, with simple structure), and the role that a man is to play in a subsequent narrative may determine whether habits or tastes will be included in the portrait of him. Such matters Dr. Schaar rarely considers. Had he done so more thoroughly the precise nature of Chaucer's originality in his handling of description would have been more apparent. We are told, for instance (p. 290), that 'the stress on the hero's armour and outfit encountered in the second book [of *Troilus*] has a fairly strong traditional support in the French romans', but not whether Chaucer's dramatic use of the convention here is an unusual one. In a similar way, Chaucer does not present the conventional description of the lady's beautiful body when she is first introduced in the poem, but, aptly, when *Troilus* becomes her lover.

Dr. Schaar does not keep in mind how much is left to dialogue in Chaucer's writings to convey emotion and character, and he tries to base general conclusions about Chaucer's representation of emotion and character on descriptive material alone. In doing so, he is led to some wholly inaccurate statements: for example, that 'there is nothing about [the lower and middle-class characters] that invites us to identify our feelings or thoughts with theirs'; they have no 'inner life', no 'inner motives', but 'in most cases only an outward dimension'

(p. 332). Can this be said of the Wife of Bath, devout old John the carpenter, *hoote deynous Symkyn*, or Absolon, who wept with shock, *as dooth a child that is ybete*, or many others?

Occasionally there is evidence of slapdash writing and reading. In the comparison of the *Clerk's Tale* with its analogues, some details (pp. 156 f.) are incorrect, though an accurate, and more perceptive, account of the *Tale* is given earlier (p. 72); the meaning 'firm', 'unmoved', for ME. *sad* appears to be unfamiliar (p. 73). Slips occur in the discussion of *Troilus*. The stanza at III. 1695 ff. is misinterpreted: it is not the last night the lovers spend together in happiness, and there is no justification in the text for saying of this 'fatal morning' that 'they do not know what it signifies, but it casts an ice-cold gloom into their bower' (p. 38). 'Love had opened its gates to her' is inaccurate even as a paraphrase of *love . . . of alle joie hadde opned hire the yate* (p. 34). It can hardly be maintained (p. 133) that the simile of the flowers reviving in the morning sun (*Troilus*, II. 967 ff.) relates only to the opening of Troilus's eyes and not to his emotions, or that the simile in *Filostrato*, III. v. 12, relates only to Troilo's smile and not to his feeling of 'new joy'. Indeed, a more systematic comparison of emotional passages in *Troilus* and the *Filostrato* would have been advisable; partial comparison is misleading. We should have been told that the *esy sykes* of the contented lover are taken from the Italian (p. 35). It is not the case (p. 36) that in the *Filostrato* 'the intensity of the feelings never results in a swoon'; Troilo swoons when he hears of the exchange of Criseida (IV. v. 18), and Criseida swoons with grief on their last night together (IV. v. 117). The image of love's arrow piercing Troilo's heart is not omitted by Chaucer (p. 28), but transferred and set before the description of the moment when Troilus catches sight of Criseyde (I. 206 ff.). The image is recalled three times in the account of his falling in love: his eye pierced so deep into the crowd, *til on Criseyde it smot, and ther it stente*; as he looked, the fixed and deep impression of her in *his hertes botme gan to stiken*, and he returned home, *with hire look thorough-shoten and thorough-darted*. Dr. Schaar does not discuss the rich metaphorical language in the description of emotion in *Troilus*, though this is one of its most remarkable features.

The brief notes on the vocabulary used by Chaucer in his descriptions are inadequate, as Dr. Schaar himself points out (p. 122), and should have been omitted. The information given is too haphazard to have significance. *Double*, in the sense 'false', may be 'reserved for the early poems', but (for what it is worth) *doublenesse* certainly occurs in the *Squire's Tale*; and what can we conclude from the fact that *heer* (hair) 'is strikingly rare' in *Troilus*, or that *ire* 'is used more sparingly' in *Troilus* than in the *Knight's Tale* and *Summoner's Tale*?

The examination of the numerous background texts is not always thorough enough to be of value. The treatment of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (to take an obvious example) is perfunctory, and more could certainly be said about the representation of emotion in French narrative poetry. It is also surprising to find no mention of Joseph of Exeter's portrait of Helen (a masterpiece of rhetorical virtuosity) in the account of the women in Joseph's fourth (not first) book (pp. 281, 330), though Guido's simpler portrait is quoted. The reliability of

Dr. Schaar's material and conclusions is uneven, but he has directed attention to a subject of great interest. His substantial collection of descriptive material drawn from all the Latin, French, Italian, and English authors likely to have been known to Chaucer should prove useful to subsequent scholars in this field, and it will certainly remind them that they have not an easy task.

URSULA BROWN

The Thought and Culture of the English Renaissance: an Anthology of Tudor Prose 1481-1555. Edited by ELIZABETH M. NUGENT. Pp. xx+704. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 37s. 6d. net.

This stout volume of extracts and translations is divided into seven sections introduced by authors of some standing in their respective fields: Humanists, by Douglas Bush; Grammars, by Eloise L. Pafort; The Political and Social Order, by W. Gordon Zeeveld; Tradition and Early Tudor Medicine, by Gertrude Annan; Sermons and Religious Treatises, by the late W. E. Campbell; Chronicles and Histories, by the late F. S. Boas; Romances and Tales, by H. S. Bennett. It is not precisely clear what part, if any, each of these introducers has had in the particular selections, separate prefatory notes, or other editorial treatment, but from what Miss Nugent says at the beginning it seems that, while readily responsive to suggestions for amplifying the contents, she is mainly responsible for the final form and details of the work.

She conceives that the book 'will aid in confirming an opinion . . . that the Renaissance . . . was a gradual flowering of the seeds of Western Culture sown in the Middle Ages', and the preponderance of emphasis in the texts is therefore on continuity rather than change. This result is probably salutary, however much one may wish to quarrel with or question the general proposition. The most meritorious features of the volume are the variety and the length of the passages, often complete prefaces or epistles, some of them contemporary translations and some (generally competent) modern renderings, the latter by hands other than the editor's. It has also been thought necessary to translate all Latin quotations, presumably for the sake of the undergraduate user of today. There can certainly be no other justification for the glossing of very many archaic English words and phrases in footnotes. It may well be wondered, however, if anyone capable of even sampling the substance of a book of this sort needs quite such elementary assistance as is repeatedly given here; and, if so, why it is not done more extensively and carefully. Many points of genuine obscurity, and deceptive lucidity, get no comment at all, or to the contrary of the context, so as to throw grave suspicion on the editor's grasp of both the idiom and the background of her material. Spelling is (defensibly) modernized throughout, though a number of oversights occur untranslated; the punctuation likewise, except that it is occasionally preserved, with puzzling or catastrophic consequences for the inexperienced reader led to expect modern usages.

As examples of misleading and erroneous glosses there are: *bourdellers*, 'jesters' (p. 47); *tatchis*, 'traits' (74); *dure*, 'exists' (95); *native*, 'origin', *solute*, 'free' (136);

engrosse, 'implant' (148); *sely*, 'pitiable' (225); *augrim*, 'counting device made of stones' (229); *remaining*, 'regarding' (257); *axes*, 'oak' (280); *like*, 'resemble' (408); *unneth*, 'only' (430); *distress*, 'rob' (496); *disabled*, 'distinguished' (533); *selven*, 'very' (642); *moewe*, 'more fully' (646). Some of these are mere guesses, and bad ones, from the context; additional expansions in square brackets, usually superfluous, provide instances of complete misunderstanding—e.g. 'a friar preacher made a sermon, and in the beginning said . . . the Bishops were *apostoli*, with a process thereupon [apostolic succession]' (p. 180). On pp. 61 [of], 355 [is], 366 [and], 409 [and], and 578 [was], may be mentioned as gratuitous and crass interpolations. As for punctuation, we have on p. 281 'some also can no letters on book so, farforth, that . . .' with *farforth* alone glossed 'to a great extent' (cf. p. 435, *ferforth*, 'in a certain degree'); on p. 43 'Also, many heads; also, many opinions' (translating *Tot capita, tot sensus*); and on p. 44 'the language is not authentic to the end that everybody may understand some thing', which might serve as an epigraph! 'But if' at least once, *available* (145), *gazophilacium* (ibid.), *ecphrastes* (147), *extra (vagantes)* (240), *cratche* (355), and 'as evil avised of after-claps' (608) want explanation.

Unfortunately these are not the only respects in which the apparatus is unsatisfactory. On p. 25 the editor refers to John (rightly) but on p. 29 to Thomas as brother of Richard Fox, retailing, too, the allegation that the latter was the architect of his foundation of Corpus. Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum*, 1516, is described as 'containing his Latin translation of the New Testament, *his own Greek version* of it, and Annotations' (pp. 55–56, my italics). On p. 120 'declinable' and 'indeclinable' are obviously jumbled with regard to the eight parts of speech specified. Richard Hunne is said to have been 'murdered in the Tower' (p. 120), when in fact he died in dubious circumstances in the Lollards' Tower of the Bishop of London's prison. On p. 245 we are told that 'ten years earlier' than 1531 Berthelet had printed Marsilio's *Defensor Pacis*, though the translation to which this must refer is explicitly dated 1535. Cheke's *Hurt of Sedition*, 1549, is referred solely to the Norfolk rebels (ignoring the Cornish ones whose defence of the old religion is the prime object of attack), yet on p. 265 'kett' is glossed as no more than 'worthless fellow'. On p. 327 the conventional printed abbreviations are expanded thus: 'per venerandum in Christo patrem dominorum dominum, Johannem Alcoc, Eliensis Episcopum' (my italics), naturally followed by the rendering 'lord of lords'! John Fisher, as one of only two, can hardly be said to have been 'among the English martyrs canonized in 1935' (p. 334). Latimer is said to have preached his B.D. oration on Luther's and Melancthon's errors in 1510 (p. 364: *recte* 1524). John Hooper is said to have been a Cistercian monk at Gloucester, where in fact there was no house of that order (p. 371; *recte* Flaxley?). Richard Whytford and other monks did not refuse to take the Oath of Supremacy at the Suppression of Syon abbey in 1539, but had been reluctant at the visitation in 1534, a very different matter (p. 377).

The English epistle of Richard Methley of Mount Grace Charterhouse is said to be for a novice (p. 387), despite its plain statement that it was for a hermit inhabiting a chapel of Our Lady; the text itself misglossed to comic effect ('That is full well, sinning but ['only'] if thou had Masses sung within thy chapel'); and

ascribed to 'P.R.O. MS. 716'. On p. 398 it is argued that Fisher's treatise on *Oportet semper orare* is 'one of the first Thomistic works printed in England' because 'The *Pars Secunda Secundae* (Q. 83) on Prayer and Fisher's *Treatise* have a kindred treatment; each uses scriptural quotations and appeals to patristic authorities'. More thought might have led to the identification of the exposition on the Magnificat translated from Latin by 'John Hollybushe', 1538 (pp. 425-7), with an original dedication to John Frederick, Duke of Saxony, as Martin Luther's (not recognized in *S.T.C.* either). A similar naïveté appears in the terms of the comment on the Book of Common Prayer: 'it was the firm belief of Thomas Cranmer . . . that a creed bearing no resemblance to the ancient Roman creed with its mass and liturgy must be established to ensure the growth of the English Church' (p. 463). It is scarcely surprising that the editor is unaware of the arguments for the first English life of Henry V being immediately indebted to Thomas the 7th, rather than James the 4th, Earl of Ormonde (p. 490), and that she should supply the Christian name of Nicholas (instead of Robert) Ridley as one of Katharine of Aragon's counsel against the divorce (p. 539). The letter of Dan John Bouge of Axholme Charterhouse to Dame Katherine Manne is said to be taken from a manuscript at Parkminster, not the original in the P.R.O. or the printing in the *English Historical Review* (1892) by James Gairdner, neither of which is mentioned; and the modernization differs at several points from the authentic text (pp. 547-9).

Such slips (and others could be quoted) are not unparalleled in the independent prefaces of the volume: one, for instance, says that Henry VIII had 'unquestioned popular support' for his divorce from Katharine (p. 159) and that 'under current conditions the elaborate structure of fixed rank showed indications of disintegration' (p. 164); another, of Bishop White's funeral sermon for Queen Mary I, 'though he knew that he would be imprisoned for it, he praised her' (p. 323); and speaks of 'the neglect of preaching that began in the 15th century and continued well into the next' (p. 305); while putting Tunstall Bishop of London in 1518 (p. 309), Prior Henry (for William) Sellynge of Canterbury (p. 310), and Cardinal Pole's death five days after Queen Mary's (p. 321). It is notable, moreover, that neither the Cambridge Bibliography nor the Oxford History of English Literature is cited in the book-lists at the end of the volume, let alone such things as Canon Greenslade's study and selection of Tyndale or Miss Burton's version of Starkey's Dialogue between Pole and Lupset, of which Miss Nugent provides her own extract.

It is amazing that there should remain so many avoidable deficiencies in a work which, we are told, has been fifteen years in the making and which is produced by one of the leading English academic publishers. One might excuse the Cambridge Press the absurdity of its blurb ('The reader will find between these covers almost every kind of pleasure and profit that reading can give'), and welcome its customary concern for typographical design, if it had shown a better sense of scholarly standards in eliminating some of the grosser errors.

A. I. DOYLE

English Pronunciation 1500-1700. By E. J. DOBSON. Vol. I, pp. xxiv+444; Vol. II, pp. vi+445-1078. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. £8. 8s. net.

Dr. Dobson's monumental new survey of early Modern English pronunciation is sure to meet with exceptional attention and interest. No equally ambitious contribution to this special subject has appeared since Ellis published his pioneer work.¹ The two magnificent volumes are a credit to the famous Press that has produced them.

Of the two volumes the first, *Survey of the Sources*, is perhaps to be looked upon as the more important; at any rate it is the more interesting and can be read with pleasure, while the second is so loaded with detail that it will probably be mostly used as a work of reference.

Vol. I gives a full and skilful survey of the English sources. Biographical data are much fuller than in Ellis or in any other work, and a great number of later-discovered sources are included, among them authorities of such fundamental importance as Hodges (*The English Primrose*) and Robinson. It is interesting to find the youthful Isaac Newton among students of English pronunciation, as is also the fact that his pronunciation shows strong traces of his Lincolnshire dialect. Among important results we may notice that John Hart reckoned himself as a Londoner and evidently spoke London English, also that he must have belonged to the upper classes. The author gives good reasons for taking Bullokar to have been a native of East Anglia, perhaps Norfolk. He proves that the Welsh Hymn, generally dated c. 1500, was probably written even before that year. Förster's late dating (1586) has never convinced the writer.

Some additions can probably be made to the biographical data. The important fact, recorded by Ellis, that Wilkins was born in Northamptonshire and was the son of an Oxford goldsmith is not mentioned. Wilkins thus belonged to a bourgeois family. A note on the social position of Newton's father would have been welcome. Christopher Cooper, the most important authority consulted, was of humble origin, though he had a university education thanks to the help of Bishop Seth Ward. But the author does not mention the fact that Cooper's reference to the Bishop and the famous poorhouse (almshouse) at Buntingford seems to indicate that he was a charity boy and thus of very humble origin indeed. Nor is it mentioned that Cooper in his dedication calls himself *inferioris classis sacerdos* (presumably a deacon).

Further special research may well result in more definite information on some of the early authors. The surname may give a hint as to their place of origin. Thus Laneham doubtless came of a Nottinghamshire family. Somewhat uncommon surnames such as Gil or Bullokar may suggest where a search might be set about.

The statements of the early writers on pronunciation and spelling, often

¹ This implies no comparison with Horn-Lehnert's *Laut und Leben* (1954), which covers the whole period 1400-1950 and is largely based on different material. Dr. Dobson's book is in the main a special study of the early orthoepists. It should be added that Dr. Dobson had his typescript ready for the press in 1953 and has not used *Laut und Leben*. References to Horn are to *Historische neuenglische Grammatik* of 1908.

written in Latin, are not always easy to interpret, and the skilful analyses and elucidations of the author are extremely valuable and welcome. The writers turn out to be often dependent on predecessors. Especially, writers of school-books often very freely plagiarized earlier books. A comparative study calculated to establish to what extent the information given is first-hand and due to independent observation, or borrowed or adapted from an earlier source, is evidently of vital importance. Very little has been done hitherto in this department, and the author's contribution is a very definite step forward.

The sources are classified into: (i) minor sixteenth-century sources (pp. 1-37); (ii) sixteenth- and seventeenth-century spelling reformers (pp. 38-198); (iii) seventeenth-century phoneticians (pp. 199-311); (iv) minor seventeenth-century sources (pp. 312-444). The chief sources are found in sections ii and iii. Among them are first-rate authorities such as Hart, Gil, Hodges, Wallis, Cooper. The minor sources (in i and iv) are largely of second- and third-rate value. Yet section i includes two of such fundamental importance as the Welsh Hymn and Salesbury. It is really ungrateful to label these as minor sources, while to the remainder the term minor is applicable. A good deal of attention is devoted to Levins's *Manipulus*, and it is proved that his language shows strong northern traits. Since his rhymes in many cases seem doubtful it is difficult quite to understand why the author accepts his testimony to such an extent as he does. Levins is one of the authorities most often quoted in Vol. II.

Under each source many problems of pronunciation are discussed, which are dealt with systematically in Vol. II. The interpretations of the evidence do not always seem convincing, but the points are better noticed in connexion with Vol. II.

The first volume is a work of fundamental importance and value as an introduction to the study of the evidence offered by the early orthoepists, and it will be indispensable to every student of the subject. It is at the same time a very interesting contribution to the history of learning in early England.

Volume II, Phonology, is described by the author as a formal and detailed phonology, based primarily on the orthoepists; it aims at a new synthesis and proposes many modifications of earlier views. The central theme is 'that many elements went to make up the developing standard spoken language of the early Modern English period; that there were many variant pronunciations, many levels and styles of speech, co-existing at any time', and it is claimed that 'the variety of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century speech is more fully demonstrated than in previous works'. A detailed account of the contents of the volume is out of the question. All that can be done here is to try and indicate the chief characteristic features of this new survey of the subject, the method and principles of the author, and the validity and range of his results.

No earlier study has been based on anything like the material collected and presented by the author. As a classified collection of pertinent material Vol. II will have permanent value. In some chapters the mass of detail is almost overpowering, for instance in that on quantity. Some chapters, as those on stress and weak forms, embody more limited material and form interesting reading.

The author's presentation of what may be called the normal development of

phonemes does not differ very markedly from what earlier scholars have offered, and does not give rise to any serious criticism on the part of the reviewer. But Dr. Dobson has made an independent and a penetrating study of the subject. He attempts to go to the bottom of things and to formulate rules more exactly than has been done hitherto. He offers many interesting and original new suggestions, some perhaps not immediately convincing, but at any rate worthy of serious consideration.

The author's general outlook is on the whole conservative. This appears above all in his attitude towards his sources, on which more will be said in the sequel. He generally assumes that, apart from the phonemes *i*, *ū*, *ē*, *ō*, the late ME. phonemes had in the main preserved their sound-values till about 1500, at least in Standard English. There is no new general theory like that in Horn-Lehnert, and though the author is evidently fully familiar with modern phonological methods he does not apply them consistently to his material.

The early orthoepists have been judged in different ways, and there has for some time been a tendency rather to look down on them. Some scholars have believed more in early spellings than in direct statements by the orthoepists. Even Horn-Lehnert, who do not place undue faith in occasional spellings, are sometimes a little supercilious in referring to the old grammarians. The author takes a different view. He looks upon the orthoepists as our chief source of knowledge for early ModE. pronunciation and he finds the criticism that has been directed against them unjust. His anti-critical remarks, especially pp. 190 ff., are very apt and to the point. Incidentally many of his critical remarks on occasional (phonetic) spellings, found here and there in footnotes, belong to the most convincing parts of the book. The author's general attitude towards the orthoepists agrees with that of the reviewer, and it is a pleasure to record their rehabilitation. On the other hand, the author in his reaction rather goes to the opposite extreme.

The evidence of the orthoepists is supplemented by that of other sources, as rhymes, spellings, especially from *O.E.D.*, and the like. The author complains that *O.E.D.* is a too much neglected source of spelling-evidence. In the reviewer's opinion it is hardly right to say that *O.E.D.* has been neglected by earlier scholars, rather the reverse. The 'anonymous' forms often given in *O.E.D.* at the head of articles cannot be said to be first-rate evidence, unless they have been checked from the original collections. We do not know where the forms were taken from, and errors are possible even in *O.E.D.*¹

The most striking new feature of Dr. Dobson's book is the extraordinary extent to which he reckons with variety in the pronunciation of early Standard English. He finds the variation proved by the material in the orthoepists and by other evidence. In a review the problem of variant pronunciations and the author's interpretation of the early material will have to be a central theme.

The author is very averse from admitting mistakes in the transcriptions of the orthoepists. He points out occasionally that inaccuracies or misprints are to be

¹ As an example may be quoted the article *Kuchies kote*, stated to mean 'bedchamber, bedroom'. The only example of this 'word' is *E.E. Allit. P. B. [Purity]*, 801: *Comez to your kuchiez-kote*. The MS. has *knauez kote*.

reckoned with, but in practice he generally defends apparently erroneous forms, taking them to represent variant pronunciations, and he shows much ingenuity in collecting illustrative material from dialects, early spellings, and the like, sometimes even postulating Primitive Germanic ablaut forms to explain Modern variants.

If an early orthoepist shows apparently variant pronunciations in his transcriptions, it is generally wise to reckon with inaccuracies, omission of a diacritic, or influence from the conventional spelling or the like. It is *a priori* improbable that people used various pronunciations except in special circumstances. When Gil has *hård* twice in the Psalms, *hërd* once in another place, for *heard*, the first may have been used in church, while the other was Gil's normal form. A good illustrative instance of the risk of a too literal interpretation is the word *heel* in Hart, which according to Jespersen has [i:] once, [i] once, the forms being separated by one line. Jespersen assumes that the form with short *i* is incorrect, while Dr. Dobson assumes variant pronunciations. The new edition of Hart, by Danielsson, shows [hi:l] in both cases.

A few examples of the author's attitude towards variant spellings in transcriptions follow. We begin with an extreme case.

Hodges has [o:] twenty times, [ʌ] once in *only*, and [o:] thirty-six times, [u:] once in *one*. The author admits that an error in the diacritics is possible, but he finds it unreasonable to assume so when the transcription represents a pronunciation that has actual existence. He has found [ʌnli] in modern Herefordshire and Oxfordshire dialects. Kauter provides the single forms [ʌ], [u:] with an exclamation mark. In a case like this, sound philological method or, what is really the same thing, common sense seems to dictate that the single variant forms are to be disregarded as errors.

In other cases where the numbers of instances are smaller the author does not seem to feel any doubt, as when Bullokar has *James* twice with ME. *ā*, once with ME. *ǣ*, *five* thrice with ME. *ī*, once with ME. *ī*, *life* five times with ME. *ī*, once with ME. *ī*, *strive* six times with ME. *ī*, four times with ME. *ī*, *price* once each with ME. *ī* and *ī*. Examples of this type are numerous. It must of course be conceded as a possibility that the pronunciation varied in these cases, but they seem to belong to the class of ambiguous evidence on which the author rightly remarks on p. vi that it does not constitute proof, however plentiful.

Two sets of examples taken by the author to prove variation in the pronunciation of words with ME. *ōu*, as in *own*, *bought*, may next be discussed.

Hart in 1569 uses *ou* both in words like *now*, *our* and in *own*, *ouht*. In 1570 he distinguishes the diphthongs in *bough* and *bow* sb., *sow* sb. (the animal) and *sow*, *sew* vb., *mow* (OE. *mūga*) and *mow* vb., *bowl* (alley bowl) and *bowl* (dish) as *ou* and *ōu*, and has *ōu* also in *hold*, *own*. This indicates that in 1569 Hart was not aware of or disregarded the difference between *ou* from ME. *ū* and *ōu* from ME. *ōu*, but that in 1570 he made the distinction. The author assumes that Hart's pronunciation of words like *own* varied. It seems very unlikely that Hart should have pronounced *own* differently in 1569 and in 1570.

The case of Butler is somewhat different. He apparently records two pronunciations of the words *four* (*fourth*, &c.), *bought*, *brought*, *sought*, *thought*, *wrought*,

which have ME. *ǫu*. He denotes ME. *ǫu* by *ow*, ME. *ū* by *ou*, and the transcriptions of these words show some variation between *ow* and *ou*. But a closer study shows that in the phonological part Butler contrasts *four* with *sour*, *ought* 'ought' with *droughth* 'drought' and frequently has forms like *four*, *bought*, *sowght*, and the like. Under Accidence he has evidently forgotten to use the correct symbol, and gives the preterites of *bring*, &c., in their conventional spelling as *brought*, &c., and *bought*, *thought*, *wrought*, *four*, *fourteenth* occur quite exceptionally elsewhere. The natural explanation seems to be that Butler spoke *ǫu* in all the words, but that sometimes the conventional spelling crept in when the pronunciation was not under discussion. The author assumes variant pronunciation.

Examples like these seem to the reviewer to be ambiguous evidence. It has not been possible to examine all the material adduced by the author in favour of a common change *ǫu* > [Au]. What has been said seems to indicate that it was hardly so frequent as the author thinks.

Many would-be variants are taken from minor sources, especially so-called lists of homophones. Some such lists are very valuable, as Cooper's and Hodges's first list. Hodges's second list, which contains words 'neere alike', should not have been used as a list of homophones. The author assumes that the second list contains words that were not alike in Standard English, but were so in vulgar or dialectal speech. This seems rather arbitrary. As regards later lists, it often seems doubtful if they are meant to include only real homophones. Words of like sound may not have been only words identical in form; they may have been partly words similar in form and therefore apt to be mistaken one for another. It is doubtful if pairs such as *cure*:*cur*, *enter*:*interr*:*intire* are meant as real homophones. Nor is it always obvious what pronunciation is meant. The author takes *duck*:*duke* to imply that *duke* was pronounced as *duck*, but it may be the other way. *Duck* is *dewke*, *duke* in Scotch dialects and probably was in some northern dialects. The pair *muster*:*master* in Coles is taken to indicate a change of *u* in *muster*, but more likely Coles has in view a weakened form of *master* (*muster* in O.E.D.).

Material from minor sources is the chief or only evidence for some sound-changes assumed by the author. A case in point is the development of a vowel identical with that from ME. *ā* (in *lame*) in words like *laugh*, *half*. Several spelling-books transcribe such words in a way which at first blush seems to indicate the vowel in *lame*. Thus Cocker 1696 has *hafe*, *eye-save*, *caves*, *same*, *amun*, *lafe* for *half*, *salve*, *calves*, *psalm*, *almond*, *laugh*, and Price 1665 has *hafe*, *save* for *half*, *salve*. These spellings have been taken to indicate an earlier stage of the vowel in *father*, [æ:] or the like. Against this the author repeatedly objects that the vowels in Standard English *half* and *lame* are different phonemes, which no Englishman could fail to keep apart. The author's interpretation is of course possible, and it may be correct, but the probability seems to be that the vowel in question was the same as that recorded by Cooper and in the eighteenth century. If Cocker used a vowel such as [æ:], different from that in *lame*, he had really no other way of denoting it than by writing it *a*, marking length by a silent *-e*. The quality of the vowel was not the point; it was the fact that *l* was to be written in *calf*, *ugh* in *laugh*. The spelling would not be misleading since everybody knew

how *calf*, &c., were pronounced. An argument in favour of this solution is Coles's transcription of *halfpenny*, *halfpennyworth*, *almond*, *malmsey* as *hah-peny*, *hah-puth*, but *a-mun*, *ma'msey*. The author apparently takes all four to have had the vowel in *lame*, but the different notation rather indicates a different pronunciation, and the probability will then be that *halfpenny* had the vowel in *lame*; *almond*, *malmsey* that in *father*, in accordance with modern usage. It is hardly possible to prove which alternative explanation is to be preferred. The example shows that material from minor sources may easily be misleading.

It is not for the reviewer to decide how far the variation in pronunciation assumed by the author is credible. It is clear that a good deal of variation occurred, but it can hardly be considered as proved that it had the extent assumed by him.

A few points of special interest will next be discussed.

According to the author [y:] was still to some extent used in Standard English in words like *use*, *chuse*. The chief evidence adduced is found in Gil and Holder. He states on p. 144 that we are able in some cases to deduce the exact quality of Gil's pronunciation, adding that 'some, but not much, doubt is possible in the case of ME. [y:]'. His pronunciation cannot have been [iu], since he condemns Hart's *iuz*, and [ju:] is ruled out by other considerations. There only remains [y:]. But this is refuted by the author himself on p. 85, where he rightly points out that when Gil objects to Hart's forms the difference is often really only in the method of transcription. Among examples is his *iuz* for Gil's *vz*. A footnote adds that Gil's form may have been [y:z], but it is clear that Gil cannot be seriously quoted as an authority for contemporary [y:].

More attention may be paid to Holder's testimony (p. 265). He says *u* in *rule* and *o* in *two* are simple vowels 'framed by a double motion of the organs' (the lip and the tongue); 'the motions are at the same time, and not successively, as are *eu. pla*'. This apparently points to a vowel such as [y:]. But Holder goes on to say that they are not 'absolutely so simple vowels as the rest, because the voice passeth successively from . . . the palat to the lips in *u*, being there first moulded into the figure of . . . *i*, before . . . fully articulated by the lips'. But, he adds, if we do not admit these as single vowels, we must exclude the lips 'from being the organs of any single vowel'. This addition gives Holder away. His two descriptions are contradictory, and the author's attempt to reconcile them does not convince. The second is evidently the more trustworthy description, and it is an excellent one of [iu].

The author accepts Wyld's assumption that ME. *ā* and *ē* were merged into one in London, *ē* falling together with *ā*, and that *ē* never became [i:] in London by an internal process. He insists on this in various places. He operates with three different developments of ME. *ē* in the speech of Londoners. The normal one is that represented by all orthoepists proper without exception from c. 1500 till 1687 (Hart, Gil, Hodges, Wallis, Holder, Cooper, and others), who keep ME. *ē* and *ā* strictly apart in free position. This must have been the best Standard pronunciation. The second type is represented by Gil's 'Mopsæ', who said [mi:t] for *meat*. This must have been an affected, quasi-refined type of speech. The third, the author's ultimate London type, is mentioned by no orthoepist

and is avoided by the better homophone-lists, but apparently recorded by second- or third-rate sources (homophone-lists and rhymes). People who used this type pronounced ME. \bar{a} and \bar{e} alike in the way of later Irish (*mate* for *meat*). This type was rare even in careless forms of Standard English before 1650, and rhymes $\bar{e}:\bar{a}$ during the seventeenth century cannot be regarded as depending on the best forms of speech (§ 115).

The author is apparently puzzled by his difficulty in finding evidence of the third London type. A critical reader may ask why he does not fall back on the evidence used by Wyld. The answer is easily found. Wyld's chief proof of the identity of ME. \bar{a} and \bar{e} is Cooper's imaginary pairing of *meat* and *mate* as homophones. Cooper, as pointed out by the author, actually pairs *meat* and *mete*. For the rest Wyld relies on a few rhymes. But he was apparently under the impression that the orthoepists did not keep ME. \bar{a} and \bar{e} apart and concluded that \bar{e} was merged early under \bar{a} (under [ɛ]). It is thus pardonable that he had to adduce an imaginary dialect to explain why in London speech \bar{e} actually became later [i:]. The author is in a different position. He knows that \bar{a} and \bar{e} were kept apart in the best London speech till c. 1700. It is curious that he avoided the obvious conclusion, that Wyld's theory is wrong. The reason is that he misinterprets Gil's notice on the language of the 'Mopsæ'.

Gil says that easterners had a thin pronunciation (as *deans* for *dance*, *kiver* for *cover*) and that the same remark applied to the 'Mopsæ', who said *biccherz* for *bucherz*, and also [mi:t] for *meat*, &c. This does not prove that the easterners said [mi:t], and even if they did it does not follow that the 'Mopsæ' had adopted their [i:] from them. The history of ME. \bar{e} is quite simple. It gradually developed from [ɛ:] to [i:], but the change took place more quickly in some circles than in others. The stage [i:] was reached in circles represented by the 'Mopsæ' early in the seventeenth century, while in the best Standard English the definite change into this vowel did not take place till the end of the century.

It must be left open in how far another development, the merging of \bar{e} and \bar{a} , may be assumed for genuine London speech. If it occurred, it is probably to be explained as due to occasional overlapping of the \bar{a} - and \bar{e} -phonemes. Such overlapping best explains isolated exceptions such as *break*, *great*.

The problem is of slight importance in itself, since the result is in any case that ME. \bar{e} became Standard English [i:]. But the author's preconceived opinion has given a bias to his outlook on front vowels so that the whole system has got to a certain extent out of order. It was necessary to retard unduly the development of ME. \bar{a} , for which a stage [æ:] is assumed well into the seventeenth century. The development of $\bar{e}u$ in *dew* has to be dissociated from that of ME. \bar{e} . Cooper's and Newton's testimony as to qualitative identity of the vowels in *meat* and *lip* has to be rejected as inaccurate.

The author gives a new explanation of the lengthening in words like *after*, *soft* (§§ 54 ff.). The process is one of rounding and retraction. The theory in the case of *a* is that ME. *a* has a tendency to become [æ], but certain consonants arrest this tendency, and the difference between the vowels in their free and their arrested development is then accentuated by lengthening. The product is thus [a:], not [æ:], as is generally assumed. This is original and interesting, but

it is not quite easy to understand why lengthening took place in these circumstances, and though retraction before *r*-groups is credible it is not apparent why *ss*, *ft* and the like should hold back the raising to [æ]. It is also necessary to reject Cooper's unequivocal qualitative identification of the vowels in *can* and *cast*. In modern American, where *can* and *cast* are [kæn] and [kæ:st], the lengthening is not dependent on a difference in quality between the original and the lengthened form.

The author finds that an earlier lengthening took place before *r*-groups, and that it resulted in a vowel identical with ME. *ā*. This necessitates the further assumption that in some dialects ME. *a* was fronted earlier than *ā* was. A theory that necessitates so many assumptions can hardly be the final solution of the complicated problem.

The lengthening of *a* in *father*, *rather* is held to be mainly due to the position before [-ðər]. Against this is the absence of lengthening in early ModE. in *gather*, *lather*. The author tries to rope in these two words too as examples of lengthening, *gather* having [a:] in modern Scotch and *lather* in Present English, but these must be kept out of the discussion of earlier lengthening in the first two. *Lather* has evidently followed *father* and *rather*. The pronunciation [la:ðə] is late. The writer remembers almost exactly when he first heard it. It was half a century ago, certainly before 1907 and probably in 1906, and in a good middle-class London family of the Civil Servant class. The old pronunciation with [æ] is the only one in *O.E.D.* (1902) and Western (1912), and [a:] is not recorded by Jespersen in 1909. The first mention of [la:ðə] noticed is in Michaelis-Jones (1913). Late lengthening of [æ] to [a:] in *lather* cannot have taken place. The result of late lengthening would have given [æ:] as in *hand*, *man*, and the like.

The lengthening in *father*, *rather* is probably due to emphatic stress and analogous to [i:] in *leetle* for *little*, recorded already by Gil. *Rather* is often pronounced with emphatic stress, which sometimes results in a form with lengthening also of the [ə]:[ra:'ðə:']. *Father* is a word that would often be pronounced with emphasis and with emotional colouring, not only in familiar language but also in religious use. Emphatic stress explains the long vowel in words like *can't*, *shan't*, *don't*.

Dr. Dobson has devoted the better part of two decades to his *magnum opus*, and has acquired an intimate familiarity with the whole subject, which has resulted in very strong convictions as to the details of the history of early Modern English pronunciation. This probably explains the very positive tone he often uses. Readers would be wise not to be too much impressed by this tone, which is very likely unintentional, and remember that we do not really know much with certainty about early pronunciation and its history. We can draw conclusions from certain data, which often allow of different interpretations, we can form opinions or convictions and make assumptions, but definite proof is rarely possible. This confident tone is often used by the author also in pronouncing opinions on the earlier stages of English, of which there is nothing to show that he has made a special study. Instances will be found among the following remarks on a few points of detail.

On p. 36 the author discusses Coote's query why *a* should be written in *boar*,

boat, rather than in *dove*, *dote*, and remarks that this seems to refer simply to the spelling of ME. *ō*. But since *dove* cannot have had *ō*, he suggests that *boar*, *dove* and *boat*, *dote* are contrasted pairs, the first two having [u:], the latter two [o:]. It is almost an anachronism to credit Coote with such complicated reasoning, and the simple explanation is very likely that *dove* is a misprint for *drove*, or better for *dore* (the animal). The letters *r* and *v* were often much alike in early writing. *Bevis Marks* in London is due to misreading of original *Beris Marks*.

On p. 37 it is remarked that *suster* is recorded only from Somerset dialects, but may have been more widespread earlier. Chaucer's regular *suster* might profitably have been quoted.—P. 178. *Waist* is early ME. *wacste*, in Chaucer *waast*. The base is **wahst-*, which may explain *ā*.—P. 267. The author seems to prefer deriving *hantle* 'handful' from *handtale*, since *f* did not become *t*. But *d* is apt to become *t* before *f* and *f* to be dropped after *t*. The source is clearly *handful*, and *armtle* 'armful' and the like are analogical formations.—Pp. 351 f. The author has overlooked Gil's example of *leetle* and suggests that the form goes back to south-eastern **lêtel*. The form is rightly starred, for OKent., MKent., and ESax. have *litel*.—P. 466. The explanation of Gil's *skath* from ME. *skāth*, a blend of ON. *skāde* and *skōð*, will not appeal to scholars familiar with Scandinavian philology. (*Skōð* is a poetical word and so rare that it is not included by Fritzner.)

P. 505. Shortening of *ō* in *broad* is stated to be proved by a rhyme with *God* in *Sir Gawain*. The rhyme is for *gode* : *brode* : *lode*.—P. 507. *Slough* 'cast skin' is derived from ME. *slōh*, but the base must have been OE. **slūh*, identical with OHG. *slūch*, G. *Schlauch*. The pronunciation (Λ) developed as in *rough* (OE. *rūh*).—Pp. 573 f. *Shove* and *dove* should have been placed with *coomb*, *stoop* in § 164. OE. *ū* was not diphthongized before *v* any more than before *m*, *p*. *Dove* with [u:] is perfectly in order in early ModE., and there is no reason to assume an OE. side-form with *ū*. Nor is there any need for the complicated processes suggested in order to explain the short vowel in *shove*.—P. 566. The vowel *o* in *yon*, *yonder* goes back to OE. *eo*, not to *u*, as the author states, probably having misunderstood *O.E.D.*—P. 569. *Helve* 'handle' comes from OE. *hielfe*, which explains the ME. form *hilve*. Raising of *e* to *i* is not to be assumed here. The common ME. *pible* for *pebble* no doubt represents OE. *pyppel*, a word for 'pebble' found in place-names, and ModE. *pebble* should probably be added to Standard English words with *e* from *y*. OE. *pæbbel*, *pebbel* is unrecorded. The only authority for such a form is a place-name *Pæbbeles hol*, which Middendorff explained as 'pebble hole', but whose first element is in all probability a personal name or possibly an animal's name.—P. 573. *Kiver* (*cover*) contains OF. *ue* (later *eu*), not OF. *u*.

P. 660. The author rejects what he calls the usual theory that ME. *ī* developed through [ei], [ēi], [æi], to [ai]. The usual theory is that *ī* became later [ei] and [ai], while the author prefers a direct change to [æi]. The difference is thus very slight. He says ME. *ī* would have crossed the path of ME. *ai* on its way to [æi], [ēi]. This is not at all necessary, even if *ai* had reached a stage [ei] when *ī* was diphthongized. Different types of *ei*-diphthongs are possible which can very well be kept apart. The point is of course unimportant.—P. 794. The

author assumes that *au* in *daughter* and the like represents a ME. *a* developed from *o*. This is of course possible, but the question needs investigation. The development of ME. *o* before *ht* can be profitably studied in a great number of place-names such as *Boughton*, *Broughton*, *Coughton*, *Houghton* (*Haughton*), *Laughton*, *Stoughton* (*Staughton*), also *Slaughter* Gl. Such names may give information on the distribution of the pronunciation (v:) before *ght* and of the chronology of the change. Spellings with *au* generally seem to appear first in the sixteenth century.

The proof-reading and the verification of references seem to be extremely careful. The only point open to criticism noticed is on p. 286, l. 16, where 'labial' should presumably be 'lingual'.

The author starts from the Middle English sounds, but he gives no information on the ME. dialect or dialects that Standard English continues. Perhaps he tacitly assumes that the base is the ME. London dialect. But it is not self-evident what is meant by London English. Recent research has shown that the early history of the London language is very complicated, and that there were really two sources, the language of London proper (the City) and that of Westminster. It would have been interesting to hear the author's opinion on this central problem.

The author mentions by the way here and there that early Standard English was spoken particularly in London and in the universities, but does not enter upon a discussion of general problems that might have been expected by way of introduction. One such problem is the explanation of the variation in Standard English pronunciation that takes such a prominent place in the book. Since London must have been the chief area where Standard English developed, the question presents itself whether London English was more or less homogeneous or not. London in the sixteenth century consisted of three distinct parts, Westminster, the City, and Southwark. It may well be supposed that there were differences in the English spoken in these various parts, and that it may be worth considering if the variant pronunciations within Standard English should not in the first place be explained as due to local variation within London rather than to external influence. Even if it is difficult to prove that such was the case, the point is worth making as a matter of principle. It may even be suggested that one salient peculiarity of Hart's language, his [e:] for ME. *ai*, might be a Westminster feature. There is every reason to suppose that Hart was a resident of Westminster, and two Westminster place-names show just the change of ME. *ai* to [e:]. One is *Ebury*, now preserved in Ebury Street. It is *Eye* (from OE. *ēg* 'island') in early records, but *Ebery* in 1535. The other is the now lost *Neat*, which is *la Nayte* 1324, *le Neate* 1556. The name is identical with the word *ayot*. The suggestion is made with all reserve, but this agreement between Hart's English and early Westminster English may be more than a coincidence.

EILERT EKWALL

Pericles. Edited by J. C. MAXWELL. Pp. xlii+212 (The New Shakespeare). Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 15s. net.

As the New Shakespeare nears its completion Professor Dover Wilson begins to delegate responsibility for the volumes to other scholars, and in the preface to the one under review emphasizes, with his usual modesty, the fact that his own contribution has been limited 'to suggestions here and there, mostly to the best of my recollection, of minor importance'. He also sums up admirably the problems which this play has presented to his collaborator, Mr. J. C. Maxwell: the facts that the play is probably only Shakespeare's in part, survives only in a bad quarto, is obscure in origin, and clearly much corrupted in the text.

Mr. Maxwell has made the best of a difficult and uninviting task, and has earned the gratitude of all students of Shakespeare by the judicious way in which he has dealt with the problems, summarized the available scanty evidence for authorship, discussed the possible sources, and, most important of all, considered 'what Shakespeare made of it', and presented the text in a readable form. With regard to this final point he has borne in mind the precepts laid down by Professor Fredson Bowers in his edition of Dekker's *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, also a bad quarto, but, in conformity with the traditions of the New Shakespeare, has done a good deal more tidying up by way of concession to the general reader than would be proper in a strictly critical edition. Since it is now clear enough what one may expect from the volumes of this series this procedure seems quite reasonable. It is clear, of course, that despite Mr. Maxwell's fairly detailed survey of printing irregularities much remains to be done by way of an intensive bibliographical investigation of the extant copies of this text.

On the use of sources Mr. Maxwell is commendably non-committal, contenting himself, in a brief survey, with the conclusion that 'if it was Shakespeare who first dramatised the story, all we can say is that he used a method he never used before or after'. But, nevertheless, Mr. Maxwell is able to point to a number of clear links in theme and treatment between *Pericles* and the 'Romances'. There is the theme of the daughter lost and found again, instrumental in reuniting her parents, the wicked foster-mother, the fairy-tale nature of the royal personages, the myth of 'lost and recovered royalty'. And he suggests that Shakespeare, faced with the difficulties of handling the Apollonius story, 'had the tact to realise that the deeper effects that can be achieved through it must of necessity be of a broad and simple kind'. From this point of view the absence from *Pericles* of certain types of 'tortuousness and over-elaboration' apparent in other of the later plays is a virtue, and 'the absence of detailed characterisation is by no means an unmixed disadvantage'. In his assessment of the play as a work of art Mr. Maxwell has probably said all that can be said in its favour without falling into the error of over-stating his case.

The question of authorship remains an open one. Mr. Maxwell sees Shakespeare's hand predominant in Acts III to V, scarcely if at all detectable in Acts I and II, but after weighing the claims advanced by various scholars for George Wilkins or Thomas Heywood as responsible for these sections he concludes, quite properly, that 'it seems best to leave the non-Shakespearean hand anonymous'.

As he remarks (and this is a warning all too frequently ignored by critics in this field), the state of the text does not lend itself to stylistic arguments. Nor, it may be added, do the other kinds of evidence hitherto adduced carry reasonable conviction. This state of affairs is not, unfortunately, likely to discourage the critics from continuing wild surmise in this direction.

The volume contains the usual section on the stage history of the play, contributed by C. B. Young.

ARTHUR BROWN

Shakespeare's Sources. Vol. I, Comedies and Tragedies. By KENNETH MUIR. Pp. xii+268. London: Methuen, 1957. 25s. net.

Professor Muir has given us a useful book, and he is unnecessarily modest when he writes that he will be 'content if the inadequacies of the present attempt act as a spur to some other scholar to replace it with a better'. Apart from a brief introduction and an even briefer conclusion, it consists of an examination of the sources for twenty plays. Seven 'of which the sources are not precisely known' are touched on in an appendix. For five of these the relegation is warranted, but I think Mr. Muir might well have defied the boggy of a possible 'lost play' behind *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Timon of Athens*. (It is certainly carrying open-mindedness too far to say that '*The Taming of the Shrew* may be derived from *The Taming of a Shrew*'.) A second volume is to 'discuss the Histories [and the Poems?]' and also the influence of particular books and authors on Shakespeare, and to contain conclusions. A reviewer is therefore in the happy position of being able to offer suggestions for the completion of the task, while he ought to be cautious in criticizing omissions which the author may all along have been intending to make good in the second volume. Yet this first volume ought to have been as self-contained as possible, and some work of a general scope might have been mentioned. On the bibliographical side, there is Selma Guttman's very useful *The Foreign Sources of Shakespeare's Works*; V. K. Whitaker's *Shakespeare's Use of Learning* deserves a mention; and the unelaborated comment, 'it is less certain that he knew Googe's *Palingenius*', might have been accompanied by a reference to J. E. Hankins's *Shakespeare's Derived Imagery*. But much of this can wait till the second volume, which I hope will contain an extensive and systematic bibliography; it would not cover very many pages even if it included everything that is moderately sensible and moderately important, and it would greatly enhance the value of the book.

If Mr. Muir has not given quite as much documentation as he might, he has obviously become intimately familiar with the 'several books and hundreds of articles devoted to major and minor aspects of the subject' which 'have been published during the present century'. Indeed, some of the defects of the book arise from a certain lack of proportion. The question, what constitutes a source? is not thoroughly discussed, and the main lines are sometimes obscured by what are described as 'illustrations, necessarily selective, of the way in which his general reading is woven into the texture of his work'. In *King Lear*, for example,

what is of central importance is Shakespeare's handling of earlier versions of the Lear story, and his interweaving of *Arcadia* material. This is dealt with competently enough, though one passing reference to R. W. Chambers's W. P. Ker lecture does not do justice to the light which it casts on the play; but it is an error in proportion to devote more than half the chapter to Shakespeare's debt to Harsnett. Certainly the statement 'it may be argued that Harsnett's book contributed more to the texture of *King Lear* than the source-play, Holinshed, Spenser, or Sidney' calls for extended justification in terms of a fuller account of what 'texture' is, and how it is related to other elements in a play. A certain haziness of method is also apparent in the tabular Summary. Such a table has to simplify, but the division into 'Main Source' and 'Subsidiary Sources' involves lumping together very disparate things, ranging from all versions of the Lear story except *Leir* to Greene's *Menaphon* (*Comedy of Errors*). Not enough is made of the plays where a single main extant source enables us to follow Shakespeare's adaptation with some confidence—the discussion of *Romeo and Juliet* is less illuminating than that by V. K. Whitaker in *P.Q.*, xx (1941); and a few more pages here would have been well worth the sacrifice of long quotations from Elyot, Hooker, and the Homilies to illustrate Ulysses' speech (itself, for some reason, quoted at length) in *Troilus and Cressida*.

Mr. Muir has a tendency to cite authors in footnotes in a way that suggests they support statements in the text when this is not always the case. Thus F. P. Wilson (p. 1) is not one of those who hold that Jonson's 'small Latin' should be interpreted 'hardly any Latin'; Presson, cited on p. 83 on similarities between *Troilus and Cressida* and Lydgate's *Troy Book*, is (I think, rightly) sceptical about any debt of Shakespeare to Lydgate; and Kökeritz (p. 161) bears no responsibility for the suggestion that Shakespeare 'perhaps took' Edgar's dialect from *The London Prodigal* (the relative dating is quite uncertain).

The significance of verbal parallels is notoriously a question on which most of us are apt to distrust each other's judgement. Mr. Muir seems to me decidedly too easy to convince, and this has the disadvantage of obscuring what is certain and important. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the most fully treated of the early plays, the joint efforts of Mr. Muir, Miss Farrand, and Mr. Fisher leave me quite unconvinced that Shakespeare knew Mouffet's *Of the Silkwormes*, and as it is not claimed that very much turns on the question, the laborious exposition is likely to reinforce any prejudices against source-grubbing that the reader may start with. Particularly unfortunate in this sort of argument is Mr. Muir's tendency to say that words do not occur elsewhere in Shakespeare when in fact they do: *coisterell* and *Galliarde* (p. 70) in *Pericles* and *Henry V* respectively; *meiny* (p. 151)—if the Folio is to be believed—and *century*, in the military sense (p. 159), in *Coriolanus*.

Finally, there are a number of miscellaneous comments to be made. Has the alleged 'copy of the *Metamorphoses* bearing [Shakespeare's] signature' (p. 3) been rehabilitated since Chambers's unfavourable verdict? Was Middleton's *Phoenix* 'acted not long before *Measure for Measure*' (p. 103)? There seems no clear evidence which was earlier, and Miss Lascelles (*Shakespeare's 'Measure for Measure'*, p. 27) is tentative where Mr. Muir is categorical. As the New

Cambridge editors note, Smart was anticipated by Brandes on Shakespeare's indebtedness to Ariosto in *Othello* (p. 123). On p. 142, more might have been made of the possibility that Shakespeare was once a Queen's Man. Most readers could do with a reminder who Goulard was (p. 206). On p. 227, an over-compressed sentence seems to attribute to Edwards the view that the difference between the two parts of *Pericles* is connected with the presence of three compositors. I should like to know the evidence for the statement (p. 232; following Nosworthy's edition of *Cymbeline*, p. xxv) that it was in 1607 that the King's Men revived *Mucedorus*. On p. 239, if Muir is thinking of the same 'striking verbal parallel between a passage in *Philaster* and one in *The Winter's Tale*' as I am—*Philaster* iv. iv. 2-6 and *Winter's Tale* iv. iv. 129-32—it looks as if *Philaster*, where the lines are much less organic, were the debtor. On p. 260, there is no reason to think that the common 'banditti', or 'bandetti', indicates an Italian source; Bond, who is cited, does not make the claim, though he does unconvincingly link 'solidares' with Boiardo's 'soldo'.

Minor errors, though not infrequent, are seldom misleading; but the following corrections in Buchanan's Latin on pp. 170-3 may be worth noting: for *quietam*, *cum*, *molestijs* read *quietem*, *cui*, *molestius*.

J. C. MAXWELL

Shakespeare and the Natural Condition. By GEOFFREY BUSH. Pp. xii+136.

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 24s. net.

It is well known that some of the acutest of Elizabethan minds were troubled by the ambiguities of 'nature'—the facts of life as open to observation, and the laws in terms of which life becomes intelligible and significant: change and corruption on the one hand and, on the other, the ideal norm of natural law revealing the 'essential nature' of man and things. Shakespeare, says Mr. Bush, took his stand neither with those who professed concern only with the fact of natural things (whether natural philosophers, or immoralists like Tourneur's Damville), nor with those who sought to impose a pattern of values on the diversity of the human scene; he was faithful to the double aspect of experience, both to the stubborn facts and to the human demand for meanings. The comedies, he says, express an image of natural order towards which both individuals and society move; in the histories the idea of order collides with natural fact (e.g. Falstaff), but is triumphant; in the problem plays the clash is not so easily resolved, and *All's Well* and *Measure for Measure* leave us with the intimation that it is necessary to appeal to something beyond natural law before disorder can be resolved. Four of the tragedies—*Othello*, *Timon*, *Macbeth*, and *Coriolanus*—record different forms of failure on the part of their protagonists to find what they 'naturally' are and to become themselves. In *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, on the other hand, there is the same recognition of the conflicting claims of natural feeling, of the individual's involvement in evil, but the impression they give is not one of simple defeat: at the end Hamlet finds it possible to act, and Lear to

believe, in spite of the bitter knowledge they have found. 'In *Othello* and *Macbeth* we witness total defeats. At the end of *Hamlet* and *King Lear* we reach moments that seem beyond success or failure' (p. 108): it is 'as if . . . the context had altered and deepened to admit a further meaning' (p. 118). The plays thus record Shakespeare's progress, not to certainties and conclusions but to a point at which he finds it possible to imagine characters who commit themselves to an affirmation, in spite of everything. There is no specifically religious affirmation, as in *Oedipus at Colonus*; even Cordelia only 'supplies a hint of what still remains' (p. 120); it is simply that the imagination, now so fully alert and engaged, is directed towards what lies behind the paradoxical committal of the self in the face of a near despair: 'the vision, because it is incomplete, completes itself' (p. 135).

In his supple and responsive, but sometimes slightly oracular, development of this theme Mr. Bush seems to me truer to the imaginative vision of the plays than those who see them as a purely secular exploration of experience, or those who too readily find in them overtly Christian meanings; the chapters on *Hamlet* and *King Lear* most certainly reward a careful pondering. It is a pity therefore that a book containing so much original insight can at times both irritate and confuse. There is a heavy dose of over-simplification. Mr. Bush perceives clearly the tragic pattern of *Timon* (p. 62), but when he tells us that Timon and Coriolanus 'are two more noble figures whose personal defeats are seen in the hard, clear light of the southern world' (pp. 61-62), we reply that the category of 'southern' plays, so frequently used, is not a helpful one; that *Coriolanus* breaks down the simple opposition of 'personal' and 'social'; and that the original 'nobility' of Coriolanus and of Timon, which Mr. Bush assumes as given, is precisely what the plays put in question. It is far from the mark to say, 'It would have been enough for Othello and Timon and Coriolanus to have remained themselves' (p. 96). The account of the histories too does scant justice to the profounder searchings of Shakespeare's mind, already active in some, at least, of those plays. Even *King Lear* is ever so slightly pushed into shape. I would agree that Shakespeare's intention was 'to explore the validity of a natural philosophy' (p. 89), and that at the end both Lear and Gloucester 'are ready to admit a new belief' (p. 119); but no more than Othello's 'nobility' or Coriolanus's 'honour' is Lear's initial 'belief in nature' a simple *donnée*. The play questions not only the validity of that belief in the face of unkindness, but the attitudes supporting that belief. Lear goes mad not only because, confronting 'the thing itself', he finds his moral and metaphysical equipment horribly inadequate, but because he had attempted the impossible task of facing two ways at once. To say this, however, is only to qualify, not to contradict, what is perhaps Mr. Bush's main contention about Shakespearean tragedy:

Bacon said that all knowledge was his province, but Shakespeare's vision is concerned with the process of knowing; his subject is the effort towards knowledge, and it is his tragic perception that we act and believe in the face of the pain and death that our knowing implicates us in. (p. 102)

L. C. KNIGHTS

Shakespeare Survey 9. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. viii+168. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 21s. net.

The central theme of *Shakespeare Survey 9* is *Hamlet*. After Clifford Leech's critical digest of 'Studies in *Hamlet*, 1901-1955', the wheels of *Hamlet* criticism start moving again with articles on its date (E. A. J. Honigsmann arguing for late 1599 or early 1600), on its language and imagery (persuasively interpreted by R. A. Foakes), on the vexed textual problem of our times (Fredson Bowers on the 'sullied' flesh), and on its staging and interpretation by actors and producers from the Globe to the present day—including an article on the Comédie Française, 1769-1896, by Paul Benichet. The ground covered is calculated to appeal to the great variety of readers and, among the plates, the miniatures of Hamlets from Garrick to Gielgud deserve special mention for their illustration of vagaries in the interpretation of Hamlet's inky cloak.

The articles most relevant to literary studies are mentioned above. The one I found most muffled was Fredson Bowers's argument that two compositors would not have made the same blunder of setting 'sallied' for 'sullied' at I. ii. 129 and 'sallies' for 'sullies' at II. i. 39 and, therefore, since 'sally' for 'sully' is also found elsewhere, that 'sally' = 'sully'. For those who believe that both texts of *Troilus and Cressida* depend on autograph, there is a close parallel, for one of Eld's compositors set 'distraction' (F. 'distraction') at V. ii. 41 and the other 'destruction' (F. 'distraction') at V. iii. 85. Further, 'distraction' (Q.F.) at III. ii. 24 may be a common error (like the 'sallied' flesh of *Hamlet* Q1 and Q2). Such evidence would scarcely satisfy a responsible lexicographer that 'destruction' and 'distraction' meant the same thing and no editor acquainted with the cursive secretary hand would fail to allow for confusion between 'u' and 'a'; he would therefore judge such variants on their merits. This is all the more necessary in *Hamlet* because, of all interpretations of the play, there is none that 'pusles the braine, and doth confound the sence' so monstrously as the bad quarto, where Q2's 'sallied' may have originated. 'O that this too much grieu'd and sallied flesh Would melt to nothing, or that the vniuersall Globe of heauen would turne al to a Chaos' makes it evident that what the memory had not retained, parrot-fashion, the mind could never recover because it had never understood. Poised between three erroneous words and three which are correct, 'sallied' leaves editors to decide for themselves whether Hamlet's wish was for a general transmutation of the lowest element in human nature (what was gross or 'solid') into something less earthy or whether he refers only to his own (vicarious) stain ('sullied'). What I have never seen explained in connexion with the latter interpretation is how the liquefaction of what is sullied results in anything cleaner.

For my own part, I suspect that Q1 transferred brother Norway's griefs (Voltemand's speech, II. ii. 65-71—'whereat grieved', &c.) to Hamlet and that, since 'solid' and 'sallied' were homophones, the reporter connected what he heard with the sally ('assay of arms') against Denmark in the same lines, assisted perhaps by a misunderstanding of the nature of the Almighty's 'canon'. But there's no art to find the mind's construction in the reporting of Q1, and editorial sanity will best be preserved by trusting the fitter word.

The remaining articles exemplify the same catholic interests as those particularly concerned with *Hamlet*. Dover Wilson contributes another instalment of 'The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts', Georges Bonnard an account of the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana (with special reference to its Shakespeare quartos), John P. Cutts an unpublished contemporary setting of 'Get you hence' (*Winter's Tale*, iv. iv. 303 ff.), and Otakar Vočadlo an article on Shakespeare and Bohemia. Richard David reviews the Old Vic and Stratford productions of *Macbeth* in 1954-5, and the survey concludes with the usual International Notes and Reviews. This universality of appeal has its disadvantages, but they are manifestly compensated for by the way in which an attractive volume can be offered at a price which is far below anything serving sectarian interests.

ALICE WALKER

Poems of Mr. John Milton. The 1645 edition with Essays in Analysis by CLEANTH BROOKS and JOHN EDWARD HARDY. Pp. xxii+354. London: Dobson, 1957. 25s. net.

This edition, which reprints all the minor poems, English and Italian, of Milton, has been available since 1951, though it is now published in England for the first time. It does not claim to be a major recension, but is aimed at a primarily undergraduate audience which is asked to assimilate not only the usual editorial information but also an elaborate running commentary in the manner of the 'New Criticism'. The editors have perhaps not always kept this audience clearly enough in mind; for example, a reader who needs to have *Phoebus' wain* glossed for him may need help with *unexpressive* in 'At a Solemn Musick' and *influence* in *Comus* 336. And I noted one or two dubious factual explanations, as in the commentary on 'An Epitaph on the Marchioness of Winchester': the 'scarce-wel lighted flame' (l. 20) presumably means not that 'the god of marriage was summoned too hastily . . . to have well-lighted his torch', but that the feeble blaze was a bad omen for the marriage. Again, the commentary on 'The Passion' assumes, unwarrantably, that the poem is half-finished, and is silent on the difficult matter of 'perfect Heroe' (l. 13).

On the other hand, some of the remarks on the verse are so good that they make up for such errors and omissions: I think in particular of the comment on *Lycidas* 76-84 (p. 251); on *savage* in *P.L.* iv. 172; and of this observation on the verse of *Paradise Lost*: 'The dense style has little surface excitement'—in certain passages, that is, which appear 'flat' if read in isolation—'little apparent speed, but like a slowly rolling cannonball, it can break a man's leg if he puts out his foot to stop it. Mass has been integrated with movement.' The editors have also added to Milton criticism the principle of 'aesthetic distance' as characteristic of Milton's method from the beginning; it means that Milton habitually tends to 'force us as spectators to withdraw . . . to a point of vantage from which the figures are patterned and formalized'. This is useful, if a little overworked in this commentary.

By and large, one would certainly ask one's pupils to refer to this book, but

not to work with it. Its tone, despite the disclaimer of the Preface, is apologetic; it is a determined attempt to claim Milton as a Symbolist poet. Not wishing to do Spenser this service, the editors have had to minimize his effect on Milton, and for all the care they take to provide enough historical detail they give little sign of knowing how allegory worked in this period. Due attention to this would have interfered with their apologetic procedures; at one critical point they state frankly, and to my mind nonsensically, that 'the total context' of *Comus* 'is finally inimical to allegory'. The attempt to reconcile the wit who hates 'obsolete' modes of writing and the historian who is supposed to have a vested interest in them is laudable, but the wit will simply have to come farther than this. Among all the subtle distinctions made by Professor Gombrich in his recent Inaugural Lecture on 'Art and Scholarship' there is one dogmatic statement which at this point echoes in the mind: 'It is only because we know the convention . . . that the artist's distinctive contribution makes sense to us.' It is, of course, possible, as Mr. Gombrich warns us, to go too far. 'If we were confronted with the tomb which Browning's Bishop ordered in Santa Prassede with

The Saviour at his sermon on the mount,
Saint Praxed in a glory, and one Pan
Ready to twitch the Nymph's last garment off

we would assume without question that there must be some spiritual meaning behind the image of Nymph and Pan . . . Pan, of course, signifies the Universe, and the stripping of the Nymph's last garment symbolizes the liberation of the soul from the fetters of flesh.' This kind of excess has admittedly occurred in 'readings' of *Comus*. The book on Milton that we should all like to have will have to avoid both extremes. I think Messrs. Brooks and Hardy have usefully pioneered such a book, and indicated some of the pitfalls; but I cannot think theirs a very safe book in the hands of readers so inexperienced that they are not even expected (p. 271) to have read the major poems.

FRANK KERMODE

Counterpoint and Symbol. An Inquiry into the Rhythm of Milton's Epic Style. By JAMES WHALER. Pp. 226 (Anglistica 6). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956. Kr. 27.50.

The starting-point of this study is the assumption that in Milton's prosody the blank-verse line is deliberately swamped in the larger units of the sentence and 'verse-paragraph'. By imposing this assumption on the reader, at least to his own satisfaction, Mr. Whaler is set free to invent other units of measurement than the line itself. He devises formulas for phrases which overrun the line endings, adopting what he calls 'an easy method of representing them' (p. 16):

. . . if we let a connecting dash represent enjambement, the overlap
till one greater man

Restore us,

is represented as 3'—1'. Here three beats ending one line are joined to one beat of

the line following. The aggregate overlap is a trochaic tetrameter with feminine ending: 4". Again,

rolling in the fiery gulf
Confounded though immortal:

is 4'-3' . . ' (p. 17)

Mr. Whaler maintains that 'Free overlapping enables the poet at any time to extend the iambic line to an indeterminate length. The process not only accommodates but invites every variety of rhythmic unit that has a disyllabic base, whether iambic or trochaic, whether of masculine or feminine ending' (p. 19). He then goes on to play with the formulas representing the different types of so-called rhythmic units, linking them together in patterns and sequences; these, he says, provide a parallel occult significance to the overt meaning of every part of the poem. Thus he examines on pp. 54-56 'cross-rhythmic series that keep a descending order'. The first example is 'PL II, 798-800, of the monstrous progeny of Sin and Death:

for when they list into the womb $\langle 4-3 \rangle$
That bred them they return, and howl and gnaw $\langle 2-1 \rangle$
My bowels, . . .'

Eight other passages are given to illustrate this rhythmic formula and variants upon it. They include 'PL IV, 306-308, of Eve's tresses:

but in wanton ringlets wav'd $\langle 4'-3' \rangle$
As the vine curls her tendrils, which impli'd $\langle 2'-1' \rangle$
Subjection, . . .'

Mr. Whaler sketches the contents of these passages and concludes: 'Whenever

$\langle \begin{smallmatrix} 4-3 \\ 2-1 \end{smallmatrix} \rangle$ occurs, whether in simple, expanded, or chain form, the context is one that stresses or implies an idea of negation, imperfection, disorder, ruin, impotence, ignorance, hate, malice, abasement, or deadly sin' (p. 56).

Like many people who are determined to discover secrets undreamt-of in other men's philosophy, Mr. Whaler begins by assuming that there is a great and unsolved mystery in his subject. He smoothly asserts in his first paragraphs that Milton's own note 'On the Verse' tells us practically nothing and has been generally felt to be baffling. His capacity for making barefaced assumptions useful to himself is even better illustrated by his remarkable explanation of the fact that there are very few 'feminine endings' in *Paradise Lost*. This has been generally taken to indicate that Milton wished to strengthen his line endings, and thus establish the line firmly as a distinguishable unit amid the flow of his sentences. But this would not, of course, suit Mr. Whaler, who therefore asserts, as a truth too obvious to be challenged, that feminine endings have the effect of *emphasizing* the line endings, and that they are rare in *Paradise Lost* precisely because Milton did *not* wish to establish the line as a unit. Yet most critics and metrists have accepted as obvious the fact that frequent feminine endings, at least in blank verse, tend to weaken and swamp the metric pattern: later Jacobean drama, and particularly that of Beaumont and Fletcher, provides a sufficient warning of this danger. Mr. Whaler extends his own view to dismiss any investigation of the

connexion between Italian *versi sciolti* and Milton's blank verse. He declares that the feminine endings of the Italian hendecasyllables have the effect of end-stopping the lines. In fact the opposite is true: one of the problems of *versi sciolti* is that of overcoming the somewhat floppy effect of the feminine endings, and the use of double consonants recommended by Tasso serves that purpose among others.

This study in fact represents a monstrous abuse of a method of analysis and comparative study which might have certain limited possibilities. Numerical or algebraic formulas, though only approximating to the reality of the words, might have been used to show the common rhythmic element in widely differing passages, thus demonstrating what we know already: that Milton's verse does not correspond with infinite delicacy to the specific 'content' of different parts of the poem—that it is not even concerned to do so. A further use of these formulas might have been to track Miltonic echoes in English blank verse of later periods: on pp. 24 and 160-1 it appears that Tennyson in the *Idylls of the King* uses some of Milton's devices more frequently than Milton himself, while Keats's *Hyperion* avoids them entirely. These indications might have been worth pursuing. But Mr. Whaler has chosen to confine himself to Milton, and the general effect of his thesis is rather like that of a British-Israelite booklet unveiling the secrets of the Pyramids.

F. T. PRINCE

Milton and Science. By KESTER SVENDSEN. Pp. xii+304. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 45s. net.

Professor Svendsen's aim is to abstract the science from Milton's works in order to describe it, to associate it with its history, and then to restore it to its place in the poetry and prose. Science is a misleading word in the title, but a glance at the chapter headings shows what is intended—'the harmony of the spheres', 'this vast sublunar vault', 'the secret powers of stones and plants'. Mr. Svendsen takes all Milton's works into consideration, but his main concern is with *Paradise Lost*.

Paradise Lost, it is generally agreed, is quite literally universal in its scope: its dimensions of length, breadth, and height are defined in terms of all time, all space, all the scale of creatures; at the centre of the universe of the poem is man, at the circumference the totality of God's design for him. Nothing whatsoever, therefore, is extraneous or irrelevant. Milton's subject, as well as the literary tradition in which he wrote, demanded that his epic be a 'book of universal learning'. Inevitably science finds its place there. Mr. Svendsen works through the lore of the different constituents of the cosmos as they are represented in *Paradise Lost*, demonstrating not merely that science has a place in the background of the poem, but that it is part of its stuff and substance, enlarging meanings, enriching texture, supplying images, and giving body to the abstract theological and moral theme and situation. He establishes conclusively that though

Milton undoubtedly read the books to which source-hunters have tracked him, it is rarely possible or necessary to claim positive and single indebtedness for the origins of his 'science' because it was common property, accessible to all in the encyclopaedias. These, from Pliny's to those of the Renaissance and seventeenth century, had collected together and presented as a universal system the common stock of popular learning as it had grown up from classical, patristic, rabbinical, and medieval traditions, from the lore of bestiary, herbal, and lapidary, from the 'sciences' of alchemy, astrology, and cosmology, and from travellers' tales. It is the science of the encyclopaedias which is to be found in Milton's works.

Mr. Svendsen is aware that science is only one of many ways into *Paradise Lost*, but his chosen concentration on it sometimes unintentionally obscures interrelations of meaning contributed from other sources. For instance, he investigates at length the confusion of traditional commentary on the firmament and the crystalline sphere in order to annotate Milton's 'firmament', 'glassie sea', 'crystalline ocean', but even without science the Book of Revelation and the first chapter of Genesis could have accounted for Milton's choice of words and ideas. The compasses of creation in Book VII are scientific, but both image and word are also supplied in the Book of Proverbs. Mr. Svendsen applauds the scientific accuracy of the phrase 'living Soule' of Book VII, l. 388, but it seems more probably an instance of Milton's linguistic accuracy in correctly translating Genesis i. 20 (see the marginal note in the Authorized Version). The Bible is never very far away from Milton's poem; farther, but very present, is classical mythology: Raphael is linked with the solar phoenix certainly, but he is also Maia's son, messenger of the Gods. These are details, but they indicate a tendency in Mr. Svendsen's book to isolate science too exclusively, or to find it causal where it is coincidental.

The major part of Mr. Svendsen's book is descriptive, establishing the omnipresence of traditional science in Milton's work. Into the last two chapters he has to compress what he recognizes as the chief object of his study, his conclusions on the function of science in Milton's art. In his chapter on the prose he interestingly illustrates the power of the imagery to reinforce at the poetic level the logic and rhetoric of the argument. (His findings, of course, apply equally to the non-scientific as to the scientific images.) The concluding chapter, on *Paradise Lost*, is more controversial. Mr. Svendsen's contention is that science is fundamentally structural, shaping and ordering the poem, developing its cosmic rhythms and dimensions, delineating character, and enforcing through central correspondences and symbols its essential themes. That science is one of the ingredients integrated into the structure, theme, and mood of the poem, and thus has its function in establishing them, is undeniable. To say more than that is to overemphasize. It would be agreed that one of the main contributory themes of the poem is an exploration of the proper exercise and use of speculative knowledge and that the dialogue on astronomy in Book VIII, with its offer of alternative systems, has its part in the assertion and illustration of this theme. But when Mr. Svendsen declares this dialogue to be the *central* image in the dualistic and ambivalent design and mode and double plot of the poem—and not everyone will be prepared to grant him that *Paradise Lost* has a double plot and

is fundamentally dualistic—then surely overemphasis has reached the point of distortion.

R. H. SYFRET

Joseph Glanvill, Anglican Apologist. By JACKSON I. COPE. Pp. viii+176. St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1956. \$3.75.

Here is the first full-scale study of the career of the most colourful (from the literary point of view) of the *virtuosi* of the later seventeenth century and the most rewarding of the latitudinarian divines. It required a delicate and agile sensibility, which happily Mr. Cope possesses, to depict one who was both the inspirer of Arnold's Scholar Gipsy and the herald of the Age of Reason: for these two (apparently) contrary states of the human soul represent just one of the puzzles of Glanvill's genius. The great enemy of enthusiasm, he was also the philosophical defender of ghosts and the assiduous hunter of witches. His friend and contemporary, Robert Boyle, represents a similar coherence, or at least, coincidence, of credulity and incredulity. The latter's acceptance of the *alkahest* and other alchemical mysteries along with his more sober 'sceptical' positions is exactly comparable with the Cartesian Glanvill's belief in the *archeus* and the World Soul. The special interest of Glanvill's work, however, lies in the vigour, indeed passion, with which at different times he maintains his different points of view. Boyle was always temperate in his likes and dislikes, but Glanvill's attack on the 'Fanatics' has all the earnestness of the Puritans themselves, whilst his excited advocacy of some of the more extravagant notions of Henry More or the Duchess of Newcastle reminds us that we are happily in a world where (as in the work of Thomas Browne) poetry and science are yet undivided.

It is a pity that the comparison with Browne is not pressed. Glanvill's style in *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* and elsewhere is almost embarrassingly imitative of Browne in his most characteristic vein. Indeed, his temper is much closer to that of Browne than to any other contemporary. Boyle, for all his 'physico-theology' and his occasional flights of rhetoric, has an eighteenth-century restraint about him lacking in More, Glanvill, and Browne. On the other hand, there are undeniable eighteenth-century anticipations in Glanvill too, which Mr. Cope illustrates very well. His challenge to enthusiasm has already been mentioned; but in addition to this, it is pointed out in the most valuable chapter of this study that Glanvill channelled into the eighteenth century a new kind of scepticism (ultimately derived from the *Timaeus* through the writings of the Middle Platonist Albinus) which finally issues in the radical idealism of Berkeley. With Glanvill (as with Plato) it is still possible to preserve a hearty interest in the phenomena as the area of probability and as the reflection of a more absolute realm of truth. This type of Platonism, which yokes the world of Matter and Spirit together in a kind of unlike resemblance based on the essential contingency of the former, is to be distinguished from the *Eros*-philosophy of the sixteenth-century Florentines and the mathematical Platonism of Galileo. One is grateful to Mr. Cope for having traced the provenance of this Middle Platonism through Stanley (*History*

of *Philosophy*, 1655-62) and Albinus, and for having indicated Glanvill's achievement in naturalizing it for England in the seventeenth century. One wonders, however, whether Glanvill's position has even as much originality as is claimed. Mr. Cope's picture of early Platonists is drawn largely from Cassirer's work on the Cambridge Platonists, where the emphasis is all on the *Eros*-principle. But there had been much 'Middle' Platonism too in the earlier Renaissance. (Cassirer's work on Nicholas of Cusa (*Individuum und Kosmos*, 1927) might have been helpful here.) And furthermore, a great deal of Middle Platonism, or something very much like it, can be found in the writings of the alchemists (not mentioned by Mr. Cope); the much-abused Paracelsus, and better still, Glanvill's own contemporary Thomas Vaughan, have much to say about the shadow of eternity cast upon the order of nature. The significance of Glanvill lies perhaps in his having attached such Platonic or crypto-Platonic themes to a more ordinary programme of scientific speculation and practice than was customary among his more enthusiastic scientific brethren.

Mr. Cope describes admirably and in detail the changes in Glanvill's style which can be noticed in the successive revisions of his essays. He carefully unravels the different versions: *The Vanity of Dogmatizing*, 1661, for instance, passes through a second stage in 1664 (*Scepsis Scientifica*) and a third stage in 1676 (*Essays on Several Important Subjects*). In this connexion (if I may be permitted a minor cavil) it is a pity that the brief list of Glanvill's writings appended (pp. 170-1) lacks any dates or other bibliographical indications. The notes are full and the whole presentation thorough, business-like, and sober. But sometimes there are rewards also for the general reader and for the mere 'enthusiast' for seventeenth-century literature. All will forgive the mixed metaphor in Mr. Cope's summing up of one of Glanvill's more illustrious contemporaries: 'All Culverwel's shining universe wavers on the quicksands of will.' Here is a phrase, and a book, worthy of the chosen author and period.

HAROLD FISCH

The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer. Edited by CURT A. ZIMANSKY. Pp. liv + 300. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 48s. net.

'With Dryden,' says Dr. Johnson, 'we are wandering in quest of Truth, whom we find, if we find her at all, drest in the graces of elegance; . . . we are led only through fragrance and flowers. Rymer, without taking a nearer, takes a rougher way; every step is to be made through thorns and brambles, and Truth, if we meet her, appears repulsive by her mien and ungraceful by her habit.' The vulgarity and violence of Rymer's prose, and the obvious absurdity of many of his judgements, have made him notorious rather than familiar. 'Who', asks Dryden, 'will read Mr. Rym— or not read Shakespear?' Yet Dryden thought *The Tragedies of the Last Age Consider'd* 'very learned, & the best piece of Criticism in the English tongue'; and even when later impertinences gave him 'occasion to snarl againe', he respected Rymer's learning and made use of it.

Not highly original himself, Rymer did much in his two longer essays to air French critical ideas in England; we have to take account of the influence of his rationalistic criticism on his age; and his significance, as his editor suggests, may lie less in the answers he gave than in the questions he asked. Parts of his work are included in Spingarn's collection; but that is nowadays difficult to come by, and this new edition makes the five essays available for the first time since the seventeenth century.

In his introduction Professor Zimansky gives a short, well-documented account of Rymer's rather shadowy life, and discusses the general attitudes underlying his criticism, his influence, and his posthumous reputation. The text is finely produced, and the work behind it is scrupulous to a fault: a bolder way with punctuation would have made Rymer a little more readable, and there is not much point in recording trivial misprints and typographical blunders in this kind of edition. (It seems inconsistent to leave eccentric reference marks and turned letters in the 'Provençal' texts as they are, and yet to normalize italics in punctuation.) The bibliography is full and accurate, and includes critical discussion of six works ascribed at one time or another to Rymer.

The most valuable part of the edition is the commentary. Mr. Zimansky has been admirably thorough in tracking down Rymer's sources, and illustrates his large debts to Mesnardière, d'Aubignac, Rapin, le Bossu, and Dacier. He reduces Rymer's status as a scholar: much of the learning of *A Short View of Tragedy*, admired by Dryden in spite of its author's 'Ill Nature and . . . Arrogance', is traced to de Voisin (quotations from the Fathers), Du Cange (quotations from medieval literature), Jean de Nostredame (Provençal), and others; and 'Rymer is apt to use footnotes', as Dryden more subtly used satire on antecedent translators, 'to conceal more than to reveal his real sources'. Occasionally Mr. Zimansky gives way to irrelevance. The slight Advertisement to Rymer's hapless tragedy *Edgar* hardly calls for a five-page note on the plot of the play and a quotation from Lounsbury; and what has Ezra Pound's *ABC of Reading* to do with the interpretation of *A Short View of Tragedy* (p. 226)? Sometimes Mr. Zimansky has failed to draw his threads together: information on the French Academy and the *querelle du Cid* is scattered in three notes (pp. 181, 237); and the valuable account of Rymer's notions on Chaucer and Provençal, taken over by Dryden and many others, is split in two (pp. 250-1, 255-7). In a commentary which admits glosses we might have been offered notes on 'Panthea . . . some Wast-coateer of the Village' (p. 46) and 'these [Characters] are shown us for our own likenesses, these are the Dutch Pictures of humane kind' (p. 76). (Are Rymer's Dutch pictures the 'public affronts' received by Charles II from the States in 1672, or the much-ridiculed 'Holland emblems'? Cf. Dryden, *The Hind and the Panther*, iii. 1056-7; Prior, *Dialogues*, ed. Waller, pp. 13-14.)

A few notes require comment. (i) With his reputation as a sage, it is not (or was not) 'hard to account for Epicharmus among the philosophers' (p. 182). (ii) George Buchanan died in 1582, after he had done his worst with James VI, not 1562 (p. 183). (iii) There seems no difficulty in taking Spenser's 'sharp judgment' (p. 5) in the 'larger signification' of 'intelligence', though 'judgment' is used a paragraph later in the common Restoration sense of critical control.

(iv) 'Bishop *Teiresias*' is not necessarily similar in tone to 'the colloquialisms in Rymer's quotations from Greek tragedy' (p. 205); 'bishop' was often used up to the seventeenth century for a pagan priest. (v) For a discussion of Jonson's supposed part in *Rollo* the reader is referred (p. 206) to Oliphant's *Beaumont and Fletcher* (1927); the appropriate reference is surely to Dr. Simpson's commentary (*Ben Jonson*, x. 292-9). (vi) For 'some sort of *Mammamouchy King*' (p. 41) a note is needed on Ravenscroft's play and Dryden's ridicule of it. (vii) Rymer may have known of Bajazet's cage from 'a romance like *Asterie*' (p. 209); but the story of *Tamerlane* was known on the Restoration stage at least from Saunders's heroic tragedy (1681), and the '*Cock-pit Play The Scythian Shepherd*, or, *Tamerlane the Great*' of which Saunders had heard was not necessarily as old as Marlowe. (viii) The first edition of Allardyce Nicoll's *Restoration Drama* is cited for an account of Italian players in England (p. 215); but the 1952 edition has fuller references (pp. 249-53). (ix) Dryden, says Mr. Zimansky, 'scarcely responded' to Rymer's attack in *A Short View*; he 'avoided formal rejoinder' (pp. xvii, 229). But Dryden took 'occasion to snarl againe' quite viciously and effectively in *Examen Poeticum*, and his satire points more directly at Rymer, I think, than Mr. Zimansky suggests.

These are slight blemishes. Mr. Zimansky's commentary is both scholarly and perceptive, and his edition is worthy of a place beside the late Edward Hooker's rehabilitation of Dennis. Both editors have made a full commentary on Dryden's prefaces, which are the critical core of Restoration literature, an easier and more urgent task.

JAMES KINSLEY

The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements (1686-1719) with some aspects of Book Trade Practice. By NORMA HODGSON and CYPRIAN BLAGDEN. Pp. viii+228 (Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, N.S. 6). Oxford: University Press for the Society, 1956.

Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements were two successive London booksellers, working from 1686 until 1719. They specialized in theology, the classics, and books relating to antiquities. They were both notable men in their trade, ranking high, but below Tonson, Chiswell, and the Churchills. Their notebook contains a number of documents of great interest for the book-trade. Mrs. Hodgson and Mr. Blagden have written an account of the trade in this period, in so far as the documents throw light on it, and going much farther in some directions. The documents themselves are published, mainly as appendixes, in the most appropriate form, the letters and accompanying accounts *in extenso*, the notes of business transactions (the acquisition of books for stock) in a systematized list. This list is remarkable for its skilful organization and for its clarity; the very few slips in it will not trouble scholars, but more specimens of the original notes on which it is based would have been welcome. The authors give a history of the notebook and a list of its contents, showing what has been left unprinted as being insignificant.

The main interest of the notebook is the information which it provides about

the wholesale distribution of books by means of a conger. This was a permanent association of booksellers, meeting regularly, who would agree to take up so many copies of a particular publication, which they would then divide among themselves; the conger would pay the bookseller less than the ordinary wholesale price of the book. The date of origin of this practice is unknown. The authors associate it with the insecure status of copyright between the expiration of Charles II's last Licensing Act in 1689 and the coming into force of Queen Anne's Copyright Act in 1710: it had the advantage of interesting a whole group of booksellers in protecting books against piracy, instead of leaving it to single booksellers to take their chances in the courts. There were also more immediate economic advantages. The wholesaling conger was sufficiently useful to survive at least until the death of Clements in 1719; as practically nothing is known about it, or about other associations of its kind (if any existed), apart from what can be gathered from the present notebook, it is impossible to say whether the practice continued much longer.

The books with which this conger was concerned are mainly such as would command a steady sale: later editions of the works of divines, poets, historians; some reference books; there appear to be no first editions of books which would command a large immediate sale. The rather large proportion of religious and theological works probably reflects the general demand of the time, rather than any specializing tendency of Bennet and Clements. The chronological index makes the list an interesting complement to the *Term Catalogues*: while they show what was published (or a large part of it), the list shows what many booksellers would regard as sound ordinary stock.

Neither Bennet nor Clements was a member of the less unfamiliar species of conger, that which owned copyrights and printed from them for its own use, and consequently the notebook furnishes no evidence for this practice; but by piecing together various scraps of evidence the authors have achieved a coherent account of these printing congers, and in an appendix trace the membership of four of them. Congers of this kind are to be associated first with the status of copyright and secondly with more general economic issues; their decline and disappearance about the middle of the eighteenth century was due to changing economic conditions.

Bennet and Clements also engaged in the foreign trade. The authors discuss this trade, illustrating its course from the in-letters of Samuel Smith, who was probably the most active in it of the English booksellers of the time; from the out-letters of Bennet and Clements, which they copied into the notebook (no in-letters to them are known), and from some of their lists of books received or dispatched; and from some figures from the Customs between 1696 and 1706. This part of the book is rather too limited by the documents in the notebook. The Dutch published for the international market important books in Latin on such subjects as theology, medicine, and classical antiquities, as well as editions of the classics, and there is evidence to show that they watched the capacity of the English market. The authors investigate closely the methods and difficulties of the import and export of books, but do not indicate the influence of the English market on these publications.

There are also a few miscellaneous documents and biographical notices of the two booksellers which show their political attachments: Atterbury preached Bennet's funeral sermon, and in Queen Anne's later years Clements was a leading, if not the leading, Tory bookseller. Although the volume is concerned primarily with the trade, and has little to do with authors and authorship or with the reading of books, it deserves the attention of everyone interested in the social history of literature in its period.

E. S. DE BEER

Wordsworth's Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by W. J. B. OWEN. Pp. 204 (Anglistica 9). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1957. Kr. 27.50.

Wordsworth's final text of his Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, the one incorporated in the six-volume *Poetical Works* of 1849-50, reproduces with only minor changes the text printed in the 1802 edition of *Lyrical Ballads*; but the 1802 text itself diverges markedly from the first version of 1800.

In this edition Mr. Owen reprints the text of 1850, and his apparatus records all variants (except variants of punctuation, spelling, capitalization, and type-found) between this and earlier texts. His 100-page Introduction begins by considering the text of 1800 and devotes separate chapters to Wordsworth's theory of metre and to his statement that 'all good poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings'. Then the additional material introduced in 1802 is discussed: the long section in which Wordsworth debates his famous question, 'What is a Poet?', and the Appendix on poetic diction. Mr. Owen next proceeds to 'a brief account of the agreements and disagreements between the two texts of the Preface', and concludes with a general evaluation in the course of which he draws an interesting comparison between the Preface and Sidney's *Apologie*.

Altogether this Introduction is an impressive performance. The very difficult business of tracing small shifts of emphasis in the course of argument, as between the one text and the other, is carried out with the greatest assurance and delicacy. Moreover, this comparative method indicates, in a way that has hitherto scarcely been attempted, the developments in Wordsworth's own understanding of his problems, and the changes of mind that lie behind many of the obscurities and contradictions of the standard text.

Mr. Owen rightly insists that there is a lot of ground common to the two texts. Wordsworth's concern, from first to last, is with ordinary humanity ('I look for Man, The common Creature of the brotherhood') and with normal modes of communication ('the language really spoken by men'); his theory of poetry is intended to direct, or redirect, attention to what is sane and central—'natural' is his own favourite word—in literature and life. But between 1800 and 1802 a change occurs in the tactics which Wordsworth uses to achieve his object. The text of 1800 concentrates on the idea of permanence. Wordsworth lays great stress on rustic and humble life because it gives rise, so he believes, to 'durable'

manners, to 'passions . . . incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of nature', to a language 'arising out of repeated experience and regular feelings' and therefore 'a more permanent, and a far more philosophical language, than that which is frequently substituted for it by Poets'. Wordsworth's argument in 1800 is based on a theory, part sociological, part linguistic, of a permanent way of speech answering the needs of a permanent way of life.

In the text of 1802 Wordsworth's attention has shifted from the idea of permanence to that of 'general truth': the rustic and his speech yield pride of place to the poet himself who, 'a man speaking to men', is now regarded as a representative human voice, giving utterance to 'the general passions and thoughts and feelings of men'. Since the poet, in 1802, is not thought of as holding rustic speech before him as a model so much as turning inward to the 'general passions' which he feels and by virtue of which he is a poet in the first place, the tendency of Wordsworth's theory is to become decreasingly mimetic and increasingly expressive.

Mr. Owen is entirely convincing in his analysis of the confusion between poetry as imitation and poetry as expression that lies at the root of the Preface. This is the outstanding achievement of a very distinguished piece of work in which the perceptiveness of the Introduction is matched by the learning and judgement of the Commentary. It might be objected that Mr. Owen slightly overstates the theme of permanence in the 1800 text at the expense of Wordsworth's moral concern: the poet commends rustic life for its purity no less than for its permanence, and his lifelong desire to be remembered primarily as a moral teacher must be read back into the first version of the Preface. There is also (to raise a second small point) rather less than one might have expected on the vexed question of Coleridge's part in the original Preface and in subsequent revisions. A reference to Professor George Whalley's admirable essay in a recent number of *The University of Toronto Quarterly* would have put readers on the road to clearer understanding.

JOHN JONES

The Italian Journal of Samuel Rogers. Edited by J. R. HALE. Pp. 326. London: Faber and Faber, 1956. 42s. net.

The original text of the journal written by Samuel Rogers in his tour through Italy in the winter of 1814-15 was certainly worth publishing, though Rogers the traveller has less interest for most readers than Rogers at the breakfast table. Only a few, presumably, will come to the journal with a view to investigating the genesis of *Italy*, and for others the entries are often too brief and sketchy to be very inviting. Even the ampler passages strike one as the kind that could have been made by an observant tourist who was not a poet or a wit. But the conscientious tourist can be a useful reporter, and the description of the Simplon Pass, for example, provides a curious contrast with the famous passage in *The Prelude* where Wordsworth describes his journey down to Italy twenty-four years earlier. There is an interest, too, in observing the way in which Rogers saw Italy

through the eyes of such painters as Claude. Mr. Hale, in his introduction, writes well about the early nineteenth-century traveller's habit of recognizing in nature what he was familiar with in art.

The tourist, moreover, is a legitimate subject for scholarly research, and Mr. Hale has brought together much useful material about the English attitude to Italy in 1814, the conditions of travel there, and the cost of living. He describes the kinds of traveller to be found after the Napoleonic War, and the growth of a market in England for accounts of travel in Italy. In the decade following 1819, he tells us, an average of seven travel books on Italy appeared every year. Mr. Hale has evidently read them all, and what he quotes from them suggests that there is room for further study of the impulse to travel in the early nineteenth century. He does, indeed, pass over one illuminating observation on this subject which Rogers himself makes in the essay on foreign travel incorporated in *Italy*. Travel, Rogers suggests, is an escape from over-anxiety about self-advancement. Among new scenes we recover our youthful spirits. 'We surrender ourselves, and feel once again as children.' Rogers's generation saw the rise of the determined careerist, the self-made man. Travel in Italy may have been one form of relief from the strain of living in a society whose great prophet was to be Samuel Smiles. Certainly there is a hint of some such recovery of youthful spirits in the more vivid moments in Rogers's journal (for example, the description of the sunset on p. 277).

There are numerous illustrations in this edition, and they are a great help to the reader in reconstructing the Italy which Rogers knew. Mr. Hale's annotations are excellent, and his introduction includes a useful reassessment of Rogers as man and poet.

GEOFFREY CARNALL

Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens: A Friendship and its Dissolution.

By ELIAS BREDSORFF. Pp. 140. Cambridge: Heffer, 1956. 25s. net.

Dickens and Andersen had read and admired each other's work before they met for the first time in 1847. During the next ten years they occasionally corresponded. Then in 1857 Andersen came to Gadshill for a fortnight's visit, which extended to five weeks; and thereafter, though Andersen wrote several letters to Dickens, Dickens seems to have written no more than one in reply. Their association meant a good deal to Andersen, who wrote an account of his visit and published it in instalments in the *Berlingske Tidende* in 1860. But to Dickens the association seems to have been a matter of small importance, and it has been slightly treated by his biographers: Forster barely mentions it; Kitton, who invents a visit in 1851, gives it two pages, Pope-Hennessy ten, and Johnson five. There is no disputing these proportions; but a future biographer will be in Mr. Bredsdorff's debt for gathering and assessing all the available evidence, and his five or ten pages will be the better for it. Besides Andersen's narrative, Pope-Hennessy used the letters printed in the Nonesuch edition, F. Crawford's edition of Andersen's Correspondence, and Mrs. Perugini's reminiscences recorded by

Gladys Storey; and in this instance Johnson was content to follow her. Mr. Bredsdorff has found much more evidence, most of it in the Royal Library, Copenhagen, notably letters addressed to Andersen by Dickens and others, and drafts of his replies.

Of this new material the most interesting is the diary Andersen kept of his visit in 1857. Mr. Bredsdorff has translated the whole text and printed it in full with annotations. Here are many details of the domestic scene at Gadshill, as well as descriptions of a visit to the Crystal Palace for a performance of *Messiah* (followed the same evening by a performance of Montanelli's *Camma* at the Lyceum), and accounts of the Command performance of *The Frozen Deep* and of Kean's production of *The Tempest*. 'In one of the acts [of *The Tempest*]', Andersen relates, 'the entire background moves by, so that the landscape changes. Juno in her coach drawn by peacocks, the air full of gliding spirits, and finally Prospero on the ship, which is sailing away, filling the whole stage and gliding over it to the side, so that one can see the whole stage, which is the outstretched sea. The moon shines on the water, and high up in the air hovers Ariel, from whom all the colours of the rainbow stream out upon the water; he waves farewell to Prospero.' His comment is equally welcome: 'The whole thing is astonishingly magnificent, but *Schackspear* himself disappears in the scenery. The performance lasted from 7 p.m. to 1 a.m. The intervals were tediously long, the gallery noisy, whistled and shouted jokes.'

Andersen's visit was not enjoyed by Dickens's family. He complains more than once of lack of consideration shown by Miss Hogarth and the children. But though Dickens himself is known to have found his guest tiresome and tedious, neither he nor Mrs. Dickens gave any sign that Andersen had overstayed his welcome, nor did Andersen detect any hint of the unhappy relationship which already existed between man and wife.

The book is disfigured by several misprints; and it is unfortunate that there are two misreadings in the text of a letter from Dickens which Mr. Bredsdorff transcribes on a page facing a facsimile of the manuscript.

JOHN BUTT

The Mind and Art of Coventry Patmore. By J. C. REID. Pp. viii + 358. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957. 35s. net.

Coventry Patmore's work has been noticed in periodicals and elsewhere in recent years by various writers including Professor Praz, Professor Gardner, and Mr. J. M. Cohen, but Mr. Reid's book is the first substantial critical study of the poet to appear in English since Frederick Page's *Patmore: A Study in Poetry* (1933), and it may be useful in welcoming it to distinguish some of the differences of view and intention. Mr. Page's short book, a model treatment of the poetry of one of the more interesting not-quite-great Victorians, was really an essay: it broke new ground on a dozen topics without attempting to exhaust any of them, and the treatment throughout was tangily personal. It is a tribute to Mr. Page's scholarship to discover after a generation how often his first word has proved to

be the last word on particular issues, and to observe how fruitful generally were the suggestions he left for others to follow up. The new book by Mr. Reid stems from the doctoral dissertation rather than the essay. Fully twice as long as Mr. Page's, and based on careful research in the U.S.A. while on study-leave from New Zealand, it is certainly the most comprehensive study of Patmore's 'mind and art' yet undertaken. The body of the book has five parts: Part I, an introduction tracing Patmore's reputation; Part II, 'Influences on Patmore and his Thought' from Emerson and Coleridge to Swedenborg and Aquinas; Part III, 'The Essentials of Patmore's Philosophy'; Part IV, 'Aspects of Patmore's Prose'—with attention to literary criticism, politics, architecture, and the theory of prosody; Part V, 'Development and Achievement in Patmore's Poetry'. The text is buttressed by an impressive bibliography, beginning with unpublished documents at Princeton and Boston, and containing—along with much else—a full enumeration of Patmore's prose contributions to periodicals. (The new list corrects Mr. Page's list in *Courage in Politics* (1921) in some details but confirms the usual soundness of what were there speculative attributions.) There is also an appendix describing Patmore's annotations on his own copy of Swedenborg's *Works*, not to mention three exemplary indexes. Clearly Mr. Reid has tried to be thorough and exhaustive. Although his book began as 'an attempt to assess the particular quality of Coventry Patmore's poetry for the mid-twentieth-century reader', it soon developed, we are told, into 'a fairly detailed study of his reading and especially of his sources', and this led more or less inevitably to a full examination of the prose. If this sounds rather cheerless—and admittedly the discussion of Patmore's ideas and sources is drawn out and inclined to be dull—it is fair to add that much of the prose (specifically, the bread-and-butter reviewing before Patmore's second marriage) is uncollected and has never been looked at so steadily before. Here Mr. Reid usefully breaks new ground for himself, but he is also assiduous in following up Mr. Page's hints—two sentences on the relationship of Wither's *Faire Virtue* (1622) and *The Angel in the House*, for example, become three sensible, unpadding pages. I should like to have had Patmore's connexions with the P.R.B. properly explained, but until more of the letters to him and from him have been edited perhaps this is to cry for the moon. The failure to examine Patmore's poetic diction is more to be regretted. In any attempt to deal fully with a poet's sources and ideas there is a danger that his poetry will be pushed from where it belongs at the centre of the picture. This seems to have happened here. Mr. Reid writes intelligently about the poems, but he has not always left himself space enough for manœuvre, and some of the criticism remains general and indistinct. A fair conclusion to the whole comparison that I have developed might emphasize how Mr. Reid's advantages in being fuller and more systematic are achieved at the expense of the unity and liveliness characterizing Mr. Page's performance. This is eminently a useful book, but it makes a muffled impact and is not excitingly written. It is not a radical re-interpretation of Patmore, but at many points our conception of him is quietly expanded.

How does Mr. Reid differ from Frederick Page in his evaluation of the poetry (which is, however highly we rate the prose, Patmore's characteristic mode of

expression)? There is a broad measure of agreement between them—they are equally firm, for example, in dismissing the opinions of those who find a gulf between the young poet of *The Angel* and the older poet of *The Unknown Eros*—but Mr. Reid insists more on the homogeneity of the Odes, which he sees as constituting 'as complex and serious a work as was written in England in the nineteenth century' (p. 307), and he is more positive about the limitations of Patmore's poetic gift in *The Angel* and *The Victories of Love*. (The remark that the 'finish' of these poems is part of their peculiar charm but keeps them 'within the order of good, rather than great poetry' is acute and should have been developed.) The degree of unity possessed by *The Unknown Eros* is hard to estimate. To Mr. Page the series of poems is a 'miscellany' constructed from the ruins of at least two other projects—a sequel to the whole domestic epic and a work on 'The Marriage of the Blessed Virgin'. Naturally Mr. Reid is familiar with this argument and he is readier than Mr. Page to recognize—I think rightly—that some of the best odes ('The Azalea', 'A Farewell', &c.) may have a purely personal origin, but he argues nevertheless not only that Patmore's order for the Odes is intended to show 'a significant progression', which may be admitted, but that it does in fact ensure that they combine into 'a coherent organic whole with a gradually unfolding theme' (p. 284), which may carry us a step beyond safety.

Finally, I have to record that Mr. Reid's commentary on Patmore's theory of prosody provides one of his best chapters and contains a firm dismissal of some nonsense that has often been too respectfully treated. The psychological explanation of these eccentricities in terms of the poet's infatuated predilection for 'law, order and harmony' is a very plausible one.

KENNETH ALLOTT

Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins including his Correspondence with Coventry Patmore. Edited by CLAUDE COLLEER ABBOTT. Second Edition. Pp. xliv+466. London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 50s. net.

To the *Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins* Professor Abbott now adds ninety-four hitherto unpublished letters. Seventy-nine of these comprise the family correspondence and the miscellaneous remainder includes three letters to Liddon and two to E. H. Coleridge. A valuable addition is the full text of the letter to Patmore (CLXXX) which deals with the *Sponsa Dei* affair. Some extracts from the Retreat Notes are also included and one, alas unimportant, letter from Bridges. Three letters from the Liddon Papers are appended.

With the publication of the material on which the late Humphry House, Christopher Devlin, and Fr. D. Anthony Bischoff have been working the Hopkins canon will be substantially complete. It is unfortunate that it begins to appear that at the same time Bridges, who was responsible for holding together the nucleus of the Hopkins manuscripts, will once more be under attack. It was perhaps inevitable, in view of Bridges's hostility towards the Society which his

friend had chosen to serve, that the story of papers scattered and destroyed and lost should be attended by suspicion. But it is fair to say that those immediately concerned with the disposal of Hopkins's papers after his death dealt with Bridges with the utmost frankness. And although Fr. Wheeler admits to destroying some of Hopkins's papers it does not seem likely that anything of much importance perished. Certainly the picture which Lance Sieveking draws (*Listener*, 24 January 1957) of 'an old fellow, all in black . . . heaping papers on the fire' the day after Hopkins's death is unnecessarily sinister. Nevertheless, there are discrepancies in testimony. Fr. Bischoff (*Thought*, xxvi (1951-2), 551-80) claims that since Hopkins's will, registered in the presence of Wheeler, leaves all his possessions to the English Jesuits, Fr. Wheeler's disposal of the papers to Bridges was 'inexcusable'. Yet the letter from Wheeler to Bridges (*Letters*, I. vi) seems quite explicit. 'Fr. Hopkins . . . gave no instructions about preserving or destroying them. Any suggestion to that effect would be made to me—and he never broached the subject at all. . . .' That was October 1889. Now Professor Abbott in the volume under review prints part of a letter dated 19 June 1889 from Bridges to Hopkins's mother. 'I wrote to Father Wheeler to ask him to return to me any of my letters to Gerard which might still be kept among his papers: and he in his reply promised to do so & said that Gerard had given instructions about his papers, etc. . . .' It may well be that no further light is shed on this point by the unpublished portions of these two letters, but one would have been grateful to see the full text in print. It is the more important that all the evidence of these transactions be made available in view of the gravity of Fr. Bischoff's allegations, made five years ago, that Bridges ought never to have been given these papers, that having been given them he refused to part with them to Fr. Keating in 1909, and that his motives in not publishing or releasing them were dishonest.

The family letters merge with perhaps disappointing ease into the known background of Hopkins's life. They swarm, of course, with his varied interests: politics, music, riddles, Greek antiquities, books for a young countess, the Tichborne case, some careful criticism of Arthur's drawings ('no searchingness'), and in the last letter, dictated during his fatal illness, a detail about a current sentimental song. They are the letters not of a scholar, a theologian, or a mystic, but of what he was, the magpie poet. Moreover, those who have come to accept the revised judgement of Hopkins as a distinctively Victorian poet and those who have never thought otherwise will find here ample confirmation of their judgement. Yet there is a modernity about Hopkins, and it consists not in his opinions or theories or tastes, all of which are rightly taken as Victorian, but in the fact that in Hopkins we see for the first time in English poetry the poem, caught fast in the nets of language, 'palpable and mute' on the page, the paradigm of twentieth-century poetics, our favourite ontological puzzle.

Three letters only broach the subject of his conversion, though these have to be read with the letters to Liddon, Newman, Urquhart, and his other correspondents at this period. The letter to his father is, as Mr. Abbott says, 'written in ice', and doubly so when set against his father's sorrowful reply and the gentle, immensely tactful remonstrations of Liddon. (Pusey, bitten before, is sharp.) There is pride in these letters and a sort of arrogant honesty very characteristic

of him, an honesty which sets truth in all its terrible righteousness above every other consideration. But there is not anywhere a shadow of duplicity, only this hard moral courage which gleams like cruelty. It is not only that he is twenty-two and 'comme tous les nouveaux convertis, il se montre très-rigoureux et très-fanatique'. These letters confirm the feeling one has all through the Hopkins correspondence that no vocation fits so well the facts of his personality as the one he so unerringly chose. But, as Coleridge said of Milton, with whom Hopkins himself has many affinities, 'the egotism of such a man is a revelation of spirit'.

Objections have been raised to the editorial policy pursued in this volume (*T.L.S.*, 21 December 1956 and 'Letters to the Editor', 1 February 1957). Given the plan of the first two volumes the arrangement continued in the present volume was inescapable, though it has to be admitted that the task of following a chronological thread is very frustrating. Yet, besides the valid reasons which the editor adduces for his arrangement, it is an advantage to see Hopkins in his several personae. On his omissions in the notes Mr. Abbott is somewhat gaily unrepentant. He had, of course, chosen (*Letters*, I. viii) to annotate lightly, but the biographical omissions to which attention was drawn in the article cited above were serious enough. There are other places where he might have been more helpful, e.g. on 'The explosions' mentioned in Letter xcvi, and the 'Imperial Prince' in the same letter; 'the Brotherhood' surely deserves a note (Letter xlv). The small textual fog which occurs in the postscript to Letter lxxiii, p. 136, where the reading 'Iced' is conjectural, may be cleared. In its Christmas number for 1875 the *Graphic*, on whose staff Arthur Hopkins was an illustrator, carries an engraving by him entitled *Iced Tea* in which Everard appears 'unmistakeably'. It might perhaps have been mentioned in the note (F) concerning the wreck of the *Deutschland* that substantial extracts from *The Times* have already been published in Norman Weyand (ed.), *Immortal Diamond* (1949).

There is a small crop of errors of transcription. In the *List of Letters*, Letters xviii, lxxv, cv, clxxxii A, clxxxiii are wrongly dated. C4, p. 405, has 1886 for 1866. Note 1, p. 122, and note 1, p. 123, have been transposed. Several references to members of the family indexed as p. v are to be found on p. xi.

But the blemishes are few and for the most part minor in an editorial task performed with grace and the highest professional competence. In his editors, Bridges, Abbott, and House, Hopkins has been fortunate.

JOHN A. M. RILLIE

The Academy, 1869-1879. Victorian Intellectuals in Revolt. By DIDERIK ROLL-HANSEN. Pp. 238 (Anglistica 8). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1957. Kr. 27.50.

The historians of certain major nineteenth-century periodicals have rightly seen them as representative of the thought and taste of the people whom they addressed. Thus, 'A Mirror of Victorian Culture' is Dr. L. A. Marchand's descriptive sub-title for his study of the *Athenaeum*; and Dr. M. M. Bevington finds in the *Saturday Review* 'Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian

England'. But nobody could seriously claim that the *Academy*, during its first and most important decade, spoke for any very large group of Victorian readers. Its editor, Charles Edward Appleton, deliberately gave the public not what it wanted but what he thought good for it. And he failed to make ends meet. The *Academy* was kept going only by its shareholders, who had donated as much as £22,460 before the paper was nine years old (Roll-Hansen, p. 159).

These backers evidently shared Appleton's desire to see the dignity and value of scholarship more widely and fully acknowledged; and it is their thought and taste that the *Academy* reflects. So Mr. Roll-Hansen does well to give rather more space to his account of the 'revolt of the intelligentsia' in which Appleton and his allies took part than to his history of the journal or even to his appreciation of its reviewing of imaginative literature.

He derives this revolt from the advanced liberalism, political and theological, of the Oxford which produced the *Essays and Reviews* of 1860. He sees it in relation to a background of philosophical idealism, and he recognizes its European connexions. He shows how certain of its supporters, inspired by the rapid progress of science and scholarship, hoped to make the *Academy* an outstanding organ of learning such as would reform British intellectual life. For, according to Appleton's manifesto of 1870,

a critical journal was demanded which should neither praise indiscriminately nor blame from pique or prejudice . . . a journal which should systematically survey the European literary and scientific movement as a whole, and pass judgment upon books not from an insular, still less from a partisan, but from a cosmopolitan point of view; a journal, lastly, in which only permanent works of taste and real additions to knowledge should be taken into account, and in which the honesty and competence of the reviewer should be vouched for by his signature. (p. 166)

In its way, the periodical was intended to discharge very much the same function as the kind of academy discussed in Matthew Arnold's famous essay. It was to be 'a central organ of sound information and correct taste in intellectual matters' (p. 104). These words are from Appleton's manifesto of 1873. They echo Arnold's remarks on the value of a 'centre of correct information, correct judgment, correct taste' ('The Literary Influence of Academies'). As was to be expected, Arnold, the most distinguished of Mr. Roll-Hansen's 'Victorian Intellectuals in Revolt', welcomed the new periodical. But he published only three articles in it. Perhaps this was because he did not pretend to the strenuous academicism of Appleton and his associates—an academicism for which Mr. Roll-Hansen, as chronicler of the movement, feels an appropriately warm admiration.

(On one occasion at least, Mr. Roll-Hansen slightly distorts Arnold's views. This is when he writes that on the subject of the Philistines Arnold 'could find scarcely any favourable comments to make' (p. 96). Arnold believed that he could best serve the middle class by drawing attention to its shortcomings, and he ascribed those shortcomings to its having Hebraized too exclusively. But he did not hide his respect for the virtues which its Hebraizing had fostered in it.)

Mr. Roll-Hansen's account of the *Academy*'s literary criticism is highly selective

and admirably proportioned. Principally, he draws attention to his journal's 'academic aestheticism' and its early championing of the principle of art for art's sake. He relates those attitudes very plausibly to the paper's main preoccupations. Both here and elsewhere Mr. Roll-Hansen is lucid, methodical, and scholarly. His book is a useful addition to our growing library of studies of the leading nineteenth-century periodicals.

J. D. JUMP

The Man in the Name. Essays in the Experience of Poetry. By LEONARD UNGER. Pp. xii+250. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 32s. net.

This very interesting book contains two substantial studies of Donne's poetry and its modern critics, a rather slight Shakespearian study, a study of Keats's Odes which, though unequal, contains some very illuminating observations, and three essays on various aspects of the poetry of T. S. Eliot.

In the first of his Donne studies, 'Donne's Poetry and Modern Criticism', Mr. Unger begins by objecting that most of the descriptions of Donne's poetry offered by Sir Herbert Grierson, Mr. T. S. Eliot, and their successors are rather descriptions, more or less metaphorical, of the experience of reading Donne's poems than accurate descriptions of what Mr. Unger calls the 'structure' of the poems themselves. He then proceeds to a careful examination of several of the *Songs and Sonets*, and has no difficulty in showing that, of the various statements about 'metaphysical' poetry he has been considering, scarcely one is wholly applicable to any single poem. In particular, he insists that almost no poem of Donne's is structurally conterminous with the development of a single metaphor or conceit, and that in several poems conceits are wholly, or almost wholly, absent; and he reaches the conclusion that

In so far as the structure of an entire poem is in any way determined, it is determined by the sequence of ideas in the poem and the relationship of these ideas to each other. (p. 83)

Mr. Unger does indeed notice the continuous argumentativeness, the analysability into prose, of many of Donne's poems, but their essential *thisness* seems to him to reside less in this than in their rich complexity of attitude. Grierson has said that all good poetry is metaphysical because it deals with love and death; Mr. Unger insists that the metaphysicality, or 'Donnishness', of Donne's poetry consists not in his choice of those themes but in his treatment of them, in his exploitation of their complexity, their contradictions, contrasts, paradoxes, and antitheses. In different poems Donne achieves this characteristic complexity by different means, or, as Mr. Unger calls them, formulas, but it is impossible to maintain either that one formula is more characteristic than the others, or that one particular formula produces better poems than the others. In the general account of the value of Donne's poetry, with which he concludes this study, Mr. Unger, although always sensible, is often rather thin, abstract, and verbose, and

becomes now and then, as Gertrude Stein once said of Ezra Pound, 'a kind of village explainer'. Nevertheless, the merits of his study far outweigh its occasional defects. It is a most patient, careful, and honest attempt to see Donne's poetry as it really is and to deliver us from the obscuring power of superficial generalizations about it.

In the study entitled 'Fusion and Experience' Mr. Unger returns to Mr. Eliot's remarks about the fusion of thought and feeling in Donne's poetry, and insists that the language both of Mr. Eliot himself and of those critics he has influenced is essentially figurative and that their criticism, which has too readily been accepted as exclusively analytical, is, as a matter of fact, largely impressionistic: 'the poetry made him feel *as if* thought and feeling had been fused'. As for 'unified sensibility', Mr. Unger suggests that the poetry of Donne and Marvell reflects, not a pre-existing unity *in* the poets, but rather an urgent search for unity *by* them. Here it seems to me that, like nearly everyone else who has written about them, he is disregarding the very large element of what I can best describe as serious playfulness in the work of these great amateur poets of the seventeenth century, and is trying to discover in them a kind of urgency and in earnestness that is characteristically modern. What is most acute and valuable in this study is his insistence that various modern (especially 'New') critics have been attracted by an illusory appearance of scientific method in Mr. Eliot's critical writings, and that this has encouraged them to attempt to interpret and evaluate poetry too much in terms of various kinds of *formulas*.

After devoting so much attention to Mr. Eliot's criticism, Mr. Unger devotes no less than three essays to his poetry. His study of *Ash Wednesday* is a characteristic and rather laborious example of the *genus* 'explication', from which I myself have been unable to derive much illumination. In 'T. S. Eliot's Rose-Garden' he produces evidence for his belief that an experience similar to that of Dante's first sight of Beatrice has a recurrent and central importance in Eliot's poetry. Here Mr. Unger seems to me to become lost among the trees, to forget the fact that the recollection of some lost possibility of happiness has found notable expression in the work of many poets, to detect far too many improbable double meanings, and to particularize the general in a way that diminishes rather than increases the significance of the passages he is considering: 'the lotus rises (with sexual significance)' (p. 178), &c. Much more satisfactory is the study entitled 'Laforegue, Conrad, and T. S. Eliot', especially where, after quoting a passage from Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* which has often been quoted by writers on Eliot, Mr. Unger puts portions of it (as he has previously done with a passage from Laforegue's *Hamlet*) into an imitation of Eliot's verse, and remarks that we find there, not merely images and ideas, but even rhythmical patterns, very similar to Eliot's own (pp. 199-201). In this study almost all the detail is relevant and illuminating, and all I can find to criticize is what seems to me a certain failure to accept opportunities to evaluate Eliot's poems and plays, either in relation to each other or as individual achievements. Perhaps, though, it is inevitable that the attempt to trace 'themes', requiring, as it does, a separation of the What from the How, should produce such an impression; and Mr. Unger does at least make some approach to an evaluation when he writes:

It may be noted, for whatever it is worth, that the later plays show an increasing unity of situation and of action but diminish steadily in the intensity of poetic language (p. 226).

J. B. LEISHMAN

Studies in Bibliography. Vol. IX. Edited by FREDSON BOWERS. Pp. vi+274. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1957. \$6.00.

Once again this annual volume presents a score of articles on a wide variety of subjects, ranging in time from the fifteenth to the twentieth century. Four are devoted to Shakespeare, two of these being closely argued examinations of the second quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, perhaps rather strong meat for all but the specialist but undoubtedly necessary and important in view of the present concern with the nature of Shakespearian texts, and the other two of more general appeal. Charlton Hinman emerges for a time from his flood of folios in the Folger Library to present a convincing enough identification of an apprentice compositor engaged in parts of the First Folio. Compositors A and B are old friends; C and D are still rather shadowy creatures, but there seems to be no doubt that they exist; so for the new-comer Hinman has chosen to use the designation E. The arguments adduced are not easy to follow, but they are none the less impressive, and some significant facts about E come to light—that he was, for example, apparently considered incapable of setting manuscript material acceptably and was only allowed to do this once, in *Titus*. Hinman refers briefly in a footnote to the ‘wealth of unexpected new information’ about the printers, the printing, and the material of the Folio which his investigations have now turned up, and it is good to know that he hopes to have completed his study in the near future. Alice Walker writes on ‘Principles of Annotation’, suggesting some new approaches to the problem which would help to reduce ‘the formidable weight’ of explanatory matter which appears only too frequently in editions of Shakespeare, which would render what was included more valuable to the reader, and which would clarify the position of the literary expert in the task of editing (a matter upon which Dr. Walker thinks there has been a good deal of confused thinking during the present century). Lexicographical matters are her main concern, and she deplores the neglect by editors of the material provided for them by *O.E.D.*, Baldwin’s *Small Latine*, and even the much maligned eighteenth-century editors. The two points stressed by Dr. Walker as requiring the attention of modern editors are: (1) what was the idiom of Shakespeare’s day, and (2) how far was Shakespearian usage in accordance with it? She might have added to her list of ‘required reading’ the volumes of the new *Middle English Dictionary* which are surely going to supplement *O.E.D.* at many points where its material is at present somewhat thin.

Cyprian Blagden attempts a reconstruction of the accounts of the Wardens of the Stationers’ Company for the first thirty-nine years after its incorporation, and thus fills in many of the details omitted by Arber in his *Transcript*. Mr.

Blagden makes it clear that the printing of these accounts presents no major discoveries about the Company, but that this accumulation of unprinted details, taken together with the items in the *Transcripts*, does throw a little light on the financial problems of the Company and the means by which it solved them.

Cyrus Hoy continues his examination of the Beaumont and Fletcher canon (Part I of his monograph having appeared in *S.B.* viii), and discusses the eleven plays which represent the joint work of Fletcher and Massinger. These fall into two distinct groups, those which are direct collaborations between the two dramatists, and those which are revisions by Massinger of plays originally written by Fletcher alone. To attempt to distinguish between collaborators in the plays of this period is indeed to play with fire, but Mr. Hoy shows a commendable restraint in handling the material and in stating his conclusions.

Textual variants in different editions of the poems of T. S. Eliot form the subject of an interesting paper by Robert L. Beare. He has had the advantage of correspondence with Mr. Eliot himself on the subject, and the literary critics will find much to interest them in evolutions of the various texts and the reasons behind some of the revisions. Some similar problems in the work of Yeats are discussed by R. K. Alspach, who, with the late Peter Allt, has been engaged on a variorum edition of Yeats's poems. It is a chastening experience to discover once again, from both these articles, how misleading may be the connotations of the words 'definitive text'!

Space forbids mention of all the other articles in the volume, but it would be ungrateful to pass in silence over the delightful 'An Initiation into Initials' by Franklin B. Williams. His thesis is that 'many minor discoveries await the literary detective prepared to apply ingenuity to the hundreds of initials that appear in British Renaissance books'. Mr. Williams's earlier articles on dedications are well known, and it is a great relief to discover, in a world in which scholars often tend to take themselves too seriously, one who can combine mastery of his subject with a lightness of touch. Although he speaks modestly of 'minor discoveries', by no means all his solutions can be so classified; but his sense of proportion becomes apparent when one reflects that in the hands of a lesser man every single one of even the truly minor discoveries would have been loudly proclaimed in a separate article.

The regular 'Check List of Bibliographical Scholarship' is omitted from this volume but is to be printed as part of the extra Volume X of the *Studies* celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Society.

ARTHUR BROWN

SHORT NOTICES

The Owl and the Nightingale. Translated into verse by GRAYDON EGGERS, with foreword by PAULL BAUM. Pp. xviii+62. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 22s. 6d. net.

A new work on *The Owl and the Nightingale* is always welcome, and a verse translation which attempts to reproduce something of its original flavour will certainly interest those who love this delightful poem. Mr. Eggers offers only a translation. On which manuscript it is based he does not tell us, and it would perhaps have made this book a little more useful if in those cases where the two versions show serious disagreement, or when neither of them is intelligible, he had added brief notes to explain and justify the third version he now presents. The rhymed octosyllabic couplet is a difficult verse-form for any poet to use. For a translator it presents far greater difficulties. Only by rare good fortune can the original rhymes still be used, so that he must remodel each couplet and finds that in its narrow compass he has little room to move. Some freedom, even licence, must therefore be allowed to the translator rendering this metre into its modern equivalent. None the less Mr. Eggers's translation is full of errors and misunderstandings of Middle English, which metrical difficulty does not wholly excuse. What Master Nicholas of Guildford, who knew *wo singet wel, wo singet wronge*, would have said to some of the renderings can only be surmised. For instance *wode* 76 does not mean 'wood'; neither does *owel* 80 mean a cobbler's awl, of all instruments the least like an owl's beak. As the introducer rightly notices, line 1758, *hit is þe betere into Scotlonde*, means 'everything is better now all the way up to Scotland', which obviously excludes Scotland. Yet Mr. Eggers translates 'Tis better to the Scottish land', in spite of the fact that nightingales are not found in Scotland. In *oȝer broȝer* 118 *oȝer* (J *owe*), a scribal error for *oȝen*, does not mean 'older' but 'own'. The opening line contains a crux, *sumere*, which has not yet been satisfactorily solved. Of the different solutions proposed Mr. Eggers's is certainly not the best. *Ich was in one sumere dale* does not mean 'One time upon a summer day'. We probably have a case (not infrequent in this poem) of transposition of words, furthered by *in one diȝele hale* of the next line. The original probably read *Ich was* (or *uwas*) *one in sumere dale*, 'I was alone in a (certain) valley'. Yet there are lines which have been better interpreted than usual, as 991, *toȝer is betere of tȝere* (J *tȝeyre*) *toȝom*, rightly translated 'which of the two's a better path' (see my forthcoming article in *Mélanges Fernand Mossé*); or 943, *Sel(d)e endeð wel þe lope*, 'The hateful seldom well succeed' (see 'On Middle English Textual Criticism', *Études Anglaises*, vii (1954), 12-16). Mr. Eggers does not take (as the majority of editors do) *hi* 10 as 'they', but translates correctly: 'And said the worst of all *she* knew.'

In spite of these criticisms, which are after all concerned mostly with points of detail, people who read Mr. Eggers's translation will still receive a fair impression of the flavour of the original poem, and will be able 'to relax to enjoy the dramatic play of these two characters'.

S. R. T. O. D'ARDENNE

Chaucers Stellung in der mittelalterlichen Literatur. By JOHANNES WALTER KLEINSTÜCK. Pp. 160 (Britannica et Americana 1). Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter, 1956. DM. 12.

The chapter-headings are promising—'Courtoisie', 'Pitié', 'Fortuna', 'Höfische Liebe', 'Superbia'—but the contents are disappointing. The quality of the author's scholarship may be demonstrated by his remark that Chaucer does not employ the expression 'mesure',

but he knows the concept and renders it by 'sobre' (p. 17, n. 25). A glance at Robinson's glossary shows that Chaucer did use the word, and a brief consultation of the Tatlock-Kennedy concordance shows that he sometimes used it precisely as the French writers did. The author has not read Chaucer carefully enough. Again, the quotations from Robinson's edition are careless in the extreme. The spelling is slovenly, and words are omitted, added, and altered at will.

The scope of the study is potentially vast, but the author's results are small. This is not a systematic study of Chaucer's work, but a close examination of a few selected passages. In the first chapter, in which the author examines the nature and origin of *courtoisie* in European literature, relatively little attention is paid to Chaucer, and it is his ironic use of the terms which is emphasized. This is useful, but far more could have been said about the place and nature of *courtoisie* in his work. 'The Knight's Tale' is treated at some length in three of the six chapters, and Theseus is accorded an importance which readers may well feel to be exaggerated.

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate how far Chaucer's ideas are in line with those of earlier and contemporary writers, and how far he is original and independent. But the author's tendency is to pick out a very few passages from the mass of European medieval literature, and make them bear the weight of his argument. For example, in his chapter on courtly love he supports his argument that Chaucer is not breaking any rules in allowing Palamon and Emelye to marry by reference to the romances of Chrétien de Troyes, and, in particular, to *Cligès*. He does not consider the point that Chrétien himself might have been breaking the rules, and on so controversial a question as the place of marriage in courtly love much more evidence should have been produced. As it happens, Herr Kleinstück is right, but rather by good luck than by good reasoning. Here, and elsewhere, his claims leave the present writer unconvinced, for one can have no confidence in generalizations based on so few particulars, especially when the author's scholarship is already suspect for the reasons mentioned above.

It is doubtful whether anyone who knows anything of Chaucer and medieval literature will profit much from this book.

MARJORY RIGBY

Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing between 1500 and 1650. By W. W. GREG. Pp. viii+132. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 21s. net.

In a charming dedicatory letter to Professor F. P. Wilson, Sir Walter Greg explains how a discussion in one of the War years of the bibliographical reliability of the entries in the Stationers' Register led to an intensive study of the Registers and later to the choice of subject for the Lyell Lectures at Oxford in 1954.

As one would expect, the lectures are full of bibliographical and antiquarian meat and only a very learned reviewer would dare to treat them analytically. On the other hand, they cannot fail to interest anyone concerned with the history of printing and publishing, and especially with the history of copyright, in this country.

Just as there were University Stationers before there were University Printers, so the Stationers' Company preceded the twenty-five soldiers of lead by whom the world was conquered. From the point of view of Church and State, the invention of printing was regarded as a menace rather than as a boon, being recognized at once as a dangerous instrument of heresy and treason. Hence a proclamation of 1538 against 'naughty printed books' and the monopoly granted to the Stationers in their charter of 1557, with its provision that 'none shall print unless he be free of the Stationers'. Two years later *Injunctions* extended the power of licensing printing to the Archbishops, the Bishops, and the Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge. Cambridge, in fact, had received a Charter in 1534 which empowered the Chancellor or his deputies to license *omnimodos libros*, and the University's insistence on this right led to a protracted, and far from cold, war with the

Stationers. That, however, is another, and provincial, story, and Sir Walter is concerned with the metropolitan supremacy of the Stationers, who had privileges 'whereby every first printer of any lawful book, presenting it in the Hall, hath the same as several to himself as any man hath any book by her Majesty's privilege'. Such was the foundation of the Elizabethan practice of copyright, and for centuries the formula 'Entered at Stationers' Hall' was regarded as the hallmark of literary ownership.

In the period under review, 'entrance' was certainly vital; the fact of publication, so far from securing copyright, might indeed lead to confiscation and punishment if the title had not been registered. On the other hand, the publisher of a corrupt text might prejudice the issue of a good text simply by getting in first. Thus the earliest known edition of Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* ('amended of such grosse faults as passed in the first impression') was confiscated as infringing the copyright of the publisher who had duly registered the earlier bad text.

Many other aspects of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century publishing are treated in these lectures, and the evolution of the separate functions of printer, publisher, and bookseller as revealed in imprints is clearly demonstrated. The whole book, based on a thousand foolscap pages of material drawn from the Stationers' Registers, is a remarkable example of distilled scholarship; the common reader may perhaps take comfort from the author's confession that he fell down badly over a *Times* crossword.

S. C. ROBERTS

The Noble Moor. By HELEN GARDNER. From the Proceedings of the British Academy XLI, pp. 189-206. London: Oxford University Press for the Academy, 1956. 3s. 6d. net.

There are some blunders in this stimulating lecture which, though intrinsically of minor importance, are unfortunate because they prevent that confidence in the critic's precise knowledge of a piece of work which encourages one to accept his conclusions about it. There are two scenes with the clown, not one. Othello's 'Tis well I am found by you' hardly indicates anything so positive as 'alacrity', and part of the point of it is the emphasis on 'you'—it is as well that Cassio has found him earlier than Brabantio. Othello does not, directly, ask the Senate's 'permission to take his wife with him'; he first 'craves fit disposition' for her, and later asks the Senate to accede to *her* request, not his, that she may accompany him.

But the lecture as a whole is, in the best sense, exciting. It excites sometimes by the provocatively paradoxical remark, as that *Othello's* 'affinities are with the comedies', a statement which Miss Gardner makes early as one of self-evident fact, and to which she reverts, persuasively if not wholly convincingly, in her conclusion. It is more often exciting by sudden illumination of a truth of which we have been only half aware, as in the brilliant passage on Othello as the 'free' hero.

And it is peculiarly refreshing in these days to find a critic who is not afraid to make short work of ill-applied psychology and of needless symbolical interpretation.

M. R. RIDLEY

Richard Crashaw. A Study in Baroque Sensibility. By AUSTIN WARREN. Pp. xii+256. London: Faber and Faber, 1957. 21s. net.

On its first appearance in 1939 Professor Warren's study of Crashaw was justly praised, and its republication in this country is very welcome. It remains the best, indeed the only, book on Crashaw, and, as Professor Tillotson noted when reviewing it for this journal (April 1941), its chapters on the Laudian movement, and on Baroque art and the emblem,

are models of graceful and concise exposition based on wide reading. The account of Crashaw's life is full and sympathetic. The attempt to define the nature and the limitations of Crashaw's sensibility is both interesting and judicious. Mr. Warren, in my view, a little underrates Crashaw's intellectual power, apparent again and again in phrases of striking suggestiveness, and is a little unsympathetic to some of his bolder effects. But although I wish he felt more strongly the haunting musical beauty of 'The Weeper' and the intellectual ardour of the *riposte* to Cowley 'On Hope', his tribute to Crashaw as the poet of worship, employing images from all the senses to reach what is beyond the reach of sense, remains the best account of Crashaw's highly individual contribution to English religious poetry.

HELEN GARDNER

Magazine Serials and the Essay Tradition 1746-1820. By MELVIN R. WATSON. Pp. x+160. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1956. \$3.00.

The title of this useful work is a little misleading, and might discourage students from consulting it. It should perhaps have read 'The serial essay in the monthly magazines, 1746-1820'. Within about a century of the *Tatler* over 500 series of essays were published in England, of which 40 per cent. appeared in periodicals consisting of a single essay, like the *Rambler*. With these Mr. Watson is not directly concerned, but he discusses the other 60 per cent., that is, the 280 serials which appeared in magazines only. A check-list gives a brief description of those serials, beginning with 'The Occasional Spectator' in the *British Magazine* for 1746, and ending with 'The Book Worm' in the *European Magazine* for 1820. Nor is 'the Essay Tradition' self-explanatory: by this Mr. Watson means the *Tatler-Spectator* tradition, with personae, persona-titles, 'characters', letters from readers, allegories, and a narrow range of topics, largely moral. The eighteenth-century serial essay is of an astonishing conventionality, since nearly every writer in this genre followed the lead of Addison and Steele slavishly, and the older tradition of the familiar essay (Montaigne, Cowley, and Temple) was eclipsed. Almost the only exception was Boswell's 'Hypochondriack' (*London Magazine*, 1777-83); and it was not until after 1802 that Leigh Hunt, Lamb, and Hazlitt could re-establish the familiar tradition in the *Examiner* and *Reflector*.

Mr. Watson's work is thorough and probably exhaustive. His careful survey has not discovered much of literary interest before 1802, with the possible exception of 'Momus: or, The Laughing Philosopher' in the *Westminster*, 1772-82, which includes realistic sketches of contemporary life; nor does he make it seem likely that many first-class writers are sheltering behind the anonymity or pseudonymity of the serials. His study is, however, of some sociological interest, as well as a valuable supplement to Graham's *English Literary Periodicals*.

M. J. C. HODGART

Selected Poems of William Blake. Edited by F. W. BATESON. Pp. xxxii+144. London: Heinemann, 1957. 9s. 6d. net.

It is now coming to be generally recognized that Blake is not, as he appeared to nineteenth-century readers, a mad or chaotic writer with occasional brilliant lyrical flashes, but a major poet, whose writings make a special appeal to the twentieth-century reader, and a penetrating, profound, if difficult and somewhat obscure, thinker. Good complete texts of his writings are easily available in the excellent Nonesuch, Oxford, and Everyman editions, and there is no lack of valuable and weighty critical monographs for the guidance of the serious student. A modern selection with introduction and explanatory notes designed for the non-specialist reader has long been needed and Mr. F. W. Bateson has now edited a volume of this kind for the pleasantly produced Poetry Bookshelf series.

Mr. Bateson's selection contains specimens of *Poetical Sketches*, the *Songs of Innocence and Experience*, lyrics from the Rossetti and Pickering Manuscripts, the famous ones from Milton and *Jerusalem*, and some of the epigrams. It also includes prose extracts from *An Island of the Moon* and *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. It is therefore, in the main, a selection from Blake's lyrical poetry, and his work as a narrative poet is unrepresented. This is unfortunate as there are a number of fine passages in *The Four Zoas*, *Milton*, and *Jerusalem* which are easily detachable and would have served as a useful introduction to those important but difficult works. Indeed a defect of the volume is that Mr. Bateson underestimates the value of Blake's longer poems. In his lively and interesting introduction he very uncritically lumps them all together under the obsolete collective name of 'Prophetic Books', a term which Blake never used, and which is really only applicable, if it is to be used at all, to the 'Prophecies' such as *America* and *Europe* and possibly to such works as *The First Book of Urizen* and *The Book of Los*, but certainly not to the idyllic *Book of Thel* or the great epics, *Milton* and *Jerusalem*.

Within its limits, however, the selection is a good one, and it is an excellent plan to place a number of the Songs of Innocence beside their counterparts in the Songs of Experience, so that the reader can see (for example) 'Infant Joy' and 'Infant Sorrow', the two Nurses' Songs, and the two Holy Thursday poems side by side. Mr. Bateson has 'normalized' spelling, punctuation, and the use of capitals. This seems wholly unnecessary as Blake's spelling presents no difficulty to the modern reader and his punctuation (in spite of what Mr. Bateson says in his preface) is often better than the 'normalized' punctuation of this selection. For instance, in *The Tyger* it is surely no gain but a distinct loss to substitute for Blake's tremendous 'What dread hand? & what dread feet?' the comparatively tame 'What dread hand, and what dread feet?'

The notes are generally acute and helpful. The long general note on the *Songs of Innocence and Experience* is particularly valuable and a model of its kind. Exception must be taken to the explanation of the name 'Nobodaddy' on p. 126. Mr. Bateson explains it as a 'portmanteau' nickname for 'Nobody's Daddy'. Surely it is a conflation of 'Nobody' and 'Daddy' i.e. the Daddy who is Nobody or the empty abstraction worshipped in eighteenth-century England under the name of God the Father.

The book should provide a useful introduction to Blake for the 'common reader', but he would do well to read with it as a supplement and a corrective Mr. H. M. Margoliouth's admirable *William Blake* in the Home University series, which, strangely enough, Mr. Bateson does not mention.

V. DE S. PINTO

The Diction of Poetry from Spenser to Bridges. By BERNARD GROOM.

Pp. x+284. Toronto: University Press, 1955; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 45s. net.

Professor Groom's book surveys the diction of English poetry from a definite though unargued point of view. It is concerned, he says, 'with the outstanding poets of some three centuries whose practice shows them to recognize an "essential difference between the language of prose and metrical composition"'. He quotes with approval Gray's remark that the language of the age is never the language of poetry, and he describes the main trend of English verse as Spenserian; Spenser is 'the earliest master of the school to which Milton, Gray, Keats, Tennyson, Bridges, and a host of other poets, belong'. This, one can only say, is a somewhat Olympian use of the word 'school'. It is clear that for the purposes of his book Mr. Groom has had to present a selective and simplified picture of English verse, from which the real problems inherent in the theory of diction have been banished.

The author is at his best in discussing poets who have an obviously fancy or unprosaic vocabulary—Spenser himself, or Browning, or Francis Thompson. He is, as one might expect, less satisfactory on Wordsworth, Byron, and Donne; though in the case of Byron he shows that he is aware of the difficulties involved in his attitude to diction, when he

admits the 'power' of *Don Juan* while wondering if such a 'non-Spenserian, non-romantic' poem has in its diction 'renounced the very nature of poetry itself'. Some poets like Blake and Hopkins, isolated from his 'Spenserian' tradition, are simply not dealt with at all. Metaphysical poetry, being considered an aberration, is very evasively treated. Within these limits Mr. Groom does give quite a thorough, reliable account of the provenance and influence of the more uncommon, archaic, exotic, or invented words used by English poets. If the painstaking investigation of poetic vocabulary had been strengthened by any attempt to probe behind the usages recorded, and discuss them critically, this would have been a more helpful book. As it stands, it will serve as an introduction to a subject that is rather more complicated than Mr. Groom appears willing to admit.

EDWIN MORGAN

Evolution and Poetic Belief. By GEORG ROPPEN. Pp. xii+476 (Oslo Studies in English 5). Oslo: University Press; Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. 15 Kr.; 15s. net.

This is a study of evolutionary themes in the work of certain Victorian and modern writers. It starts with the early poetry of Tennyson and Browning, carries the story forward to Swinburne and Meredith, and continues with Hardy, Samuel Butler, Shaw, and H. G. Wells.

The argument throughout the book is that evolutionary theory did not remain at the discursive level in any of these writers, but was integrated into their work as part of an artistic vision. Science for them was not simply a matter of fact, but was built into a scheme of religious, moral, and social values. For this reason, and whether the scientific facts warranted it or not, the interpretation given to evolution by these writers was a teleological one. The one exception was Hardy, and Mr. Roppen thinks it significant that while the rest of the group were neo-Lamarckians, Hardy was a disciple of Darwin. Lamarck allowed a belief in a creative and evolutionary process, but Hardy, though feeling the need for something to give meaning to life, could see natural selection only as fortuitous. Mr. Roppen does not confuse cause and effect here. It is not that Hardy held the views he did because he was a Darwinian; almost the reverse. As Mr. Roppen writes:

Hardy creates the tragic peripeteia, and with the sheer force of his art and thought seems to have destroyed once and for all the facile Utopian dreams of idealists and positivists alike. (p. 315)

This characterizes his treatment throughout. Literary evaluation is never swamped by the history of ideas. Nevertheless, the work of these individual authors is illumined by historical perception and there is an argument which connects them all. The great merit of the book is its description of the conceptual framework within which these authors thought and wrote. For Tennyson and Browning the Platonism of Coleridge and Shelley enabled evolution to be seen as a process of becoming, viewed against a background of eternal values. For Meredith and Swinburne the rising tide of agnosticism swept away the transcendental reference in this scheme, but still left a belief in man himself as perfectible. And this—Hardy apart—was in one form or another the faith of all these writers: a 'vision of human dignity and nobility'.

The conclusion Mr. Roppen reaches at the end of his long and interesting essay is that

The validity, or 'truth'-value of this evolutionary poetry lies, not mainly in its metaphysical or epistemological search, but in its translation of a belief in creative and purposive evolution into terms of moral aspiration and prophetic dream. (p. 462)

It is doubtful whether any of the writers he discusses would have seen his own work in quite this way.

R. L. BRETT

Changing Views of the Mind in English Poetry. By GEOFFREY BULLOUGH.

From the Proceedings of the British Academy XLI, pp. 61-84. London: Oxford University Press for the Academy, 1956. 3s. 6d. net.

Single lectures provide occasions when scholars can allow themselves a wide sweep and find in a generous prospect the stimulus, even perhaps the coherence, denied to their more circumscribed labours. Such an occasion occurred for Professor Bullough in the Warton Lecture of 1955. There has not been any satisfactory historical account of the connexions between literature and the ideas about the human mind current at different periods, although, of course, work has been done in certain limited areas. Mr. Bullough's purpose is to survey the whole scene and trace the evolution of psychological theory as it affected poetry.

He follows his subject through what he calls 'an ever-narrowing spiral'. Seven phases are discerned, points on the downward glide, each producing its characteristic kind of poetry and its representative poets. How wide a range of material and how great a power of compression have to be brought to bear upon such a subject hardly needs to be said. It would be unmanageable without Mr. Bullough's brilliantly inventive labels which supply points of focus—whether upon the Elizabethans and their 'Poetry of the Soul's Instruments' or upon the eighteenth century and 'Poetry of the Passions'. It would be too general a psychological outline without the interest of the critical ideas which keep springing up during the journey: Donne's delight in the activity of the discursive mind, the nature of Traherne's introspection, Akenside's anticipation of Wordsworth's thought. And it would be over-intellectualized without the literary advantages of a singularly widespread choice of quotation. There is, indeed, only one place where one is not carried along contentedly with Mr. Bullough, and that is when he reaches the modern age. It may be that the need for condensation forces him to use a label, 'The Literature of the "Threshold"', which seems arbitrary rather than entirely accurate here. His matter, perhaps, is less susceptible of the sharp definition which he achieved so convincingly in the earlier discussions.

ROSEMARY FREEMAN

S
ANG
Banc
T
B
Al
38
V
sk
sk
M
ur
R
T
H
BUL
Vol.
C
of
T
K
26
COM
Vol.
B
An
(F
Pa
ENG
Vol.
H
M
Sc
4-
ENG
Vol.
St
ce
H
Pe
bl
Pa
67
'R
(F
D
A
ESSA
Vol.
Sc
C
'T
ne

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA

Band 75, Heft 4, 1957

The Audience of *Piers Plowman* (J. A. Burrow), 373-84.

Alexius mit der Stiege (K. H. Göller), 385-90.

Vers und Text in den Dramenmanuskripten der Shakespearezeit (L. Borinski), 391-410.

Major Ramkins' Memoirs, Daniel Defoe und die Anfänge des realistischen Ich-Romans (F. Wölken), 411-28.

Treatment of Time in *Adam Bede* (W. J. Harvey), 429-40.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xl, No. 2, March 1958

Course of plays 1740-2: An Early Diary of Richard Cross, Prompter to the Theatres (H. W. Pedicord), 432-72.

King Arthur's Sword (E. Vinaver), 513-26.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Vol. x, No. 1, Winter 1958

Literary Status of the English Popular Ballad (A. K. Moore), 1-20.

Angel Iconography in English Literature (H. Morris), 36-44.

Pater and Apuleius (E. J. Brzenk), 55-60.

ENGLISH

Vol. xii, No. 67, Spring 1958

Hardy's *Dynasts* and the 'Mythical Method' (J. M. Stedmond), 1-4.

Some Clerical Diarists (R. Lawrence), 4-10.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxix, No. 2, April 1958

Shakespeare's Text: Linguistic Procedure and Textual Criticism (H. M. Hulme), 49-56.

Peele's *David and Bethsabe* (I.-S. Ekeblad), 57-62.

Paired Words in *Othello* (W. Nash), 62-67.

'Rude am I in my speech' [*Othello*] (H. J. Webb), 67-72.

Dating *Othello* (M. Rosenberg), 72-74.

A Mexican Marina (K. Muir), 74-75.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. viii, No. 2, April 1958

Second Thoughts: C. S. Lewis on Chaucer's *Troilus* (R. Sharrock), 123-37.

'Thou' and 'You' in Shakespeare's *Sonnets* (F. Berry), 138-46.

Action and Soliloquy in *Macbeth* (T. B. Tomlinson), 147-55.

E. M. Forster's Sense of History, and Cavafy (G. D. Klingopulos), 156-65.

A Dialectic of Aural and Objective Correlatives (W. J. Ong), 166-81.

Critical Forum: 'Kinds' of fiction, 214; *Heart of Midlothian*, 217.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

XI^e Année, No. 1, janvier-mars 1958

Shakespeare's Pastoral Comedy (R. P. Draper), 1-17.

Samson Agonistes and *Aureng-Zebe* (E. S. Le Comte), 18-22.

L'État présent des Études Whitmaniennes (R. Asselineau), 31-40.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xxi, No. 2, Feb. 1958

Fulke Greville on War (H. N. Maclean), 95-109.

Francis Bacon and his Father (P. H. Kocher), 133-58.

Dr. Johnson, Mandeville, and 'Publick Benefits' (E. R. Miner), 159-66.

Unsigned Pamphlets of Richard Overton: 1641-49 (D. M. Wolfe), 167-201.

LEUVENSE BIJDRAGEN

xlvi^e Jaarg., Afl. 1-2, 1958

Les Conifères dans la Toponymie et la Linguistique (A. Carnoy), 28-51.

LITERA

Vol. iv, 1957

Concept of Character in the 18th Century (A. Sewell), 1-21.

Relation between Meaning and Distribution (S. Saporta), 22-26.

Arnold's *Thyrsis* (J. P. Curgenvin), 27-39.

Certain Functions of Accents A and B (D. L. Bolinger), 80-89.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxvi, No. 3, 1957

Meaning of *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer* (G. V. Smithers), 137-53.

Text of the Cely Letters (A. Hanham), 186-96.

Dunbar's *Birth of Antichrist* 31-32 (J. A. W. Bennett), 196.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxiii, No. 2, Feb. 1958

The Swallow in Chaucer's *Miller's Tale* (J. R. Kreuzer), 81.

A Time of the Year for Milton's 'Ad Patrem' (H. A. Barnett), 82-83.

Milton and St. Basil: The Genesis of Sin and Death (J. M. Steadman), 83-84.
 John Trumbull and Satirical Criticism of Literature (M. F. Schulz), 85-90.
 A Device of Doors in *The Eve of St. Agnes* (W. S. Ward), 90-91.
 Sound and Sense in G. M. Hopkins (W. Gibson), 95-100.

Vol. lxxiii, No. 3, March 1958

Thomas Traherne and Original Sin (W. H. Marshall), 161-5.
 The Meaning of 'Poland' in *The Medal* (E. R. Wasserman), 165-7.
Billy Budd: The Catastrophe of Innocence (J. E. Miller, Jr.), 168-76.
 Time and *The Ambassadors* (L. Edel), 177-9.
 Illusion and Reality in Eugene O'Neill (B. I. Granger), 179-86.
 A Source for Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* (E. Solomon), 186-8.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xviii, No. 4, Dec. 1957

James Joyce: Affirmation after Exile (J. R. Baker), 275-81.
 Hawthorne and the Chain of Being (J. W. Mathews), 282-94.
 Hell's Marching Music: *Paradise Lost*, i. 549-65 (G. Ethel), 295-302.
 A Letter to Steele on the *Spectator* (R. P. Bond), 303-4.
 The Dangerous Theme of the Pardoner (A. C. Friend), 305-8.
 Chaucer Allusions: 1619-1732 (A. C. Dobbins), 309-12.

Vol. xix, No. 1, March 1958

The Philosophy of the Clerk of Oxenford (J. M. Morse), 3-20.
The Perfect Politician and its Author (A. R. Benham), 21-27.
 The Doll-Burners: D. H. Lawrence and Louisa Alcott (G. Smith, Jr.), 28-32.
 The Decorum of *Lamia* (O. B. Hardison, Jr.), 33-42.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. liii, No. 2, April 1958

Poetry and Industrialism: Refractory Material in 19th-Century and Later English Verse (J. Warburg), 161-70.
 Composition of the Clarence Scenes in *Richard III* (J. D. Wilson), 211-14.
 A Note on Massinger's *New Way* (R. H. Bowers), 214-15.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lv, No. 3, Feb. 1958

Unpublished Reply to Milton's *Defensio* (J. M. French), 164-9.
 Coleridge and Godwin on the Communication of Truth (L. Werkmeister), 170-7.

Shelley's 'Air-prism': the Synesthetic Scheme of *Alastor* (G. O'Malley), 178-87.
 New Letter of Bridges to Patmore (D. B. Green), 198-9.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

41ste Jaarg., Afl. 2, April 1958

Les Débuts du Lyrisme Profane au Moyen Âge Latin (P. Wareman), 89-107.
Ode on a Grecian Urn (K. Schlüter), 128-47.
 A Coleridge Note on Kant (W. Schrickx), 147-51.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lix, Nr. 1, März 1958

Über den englischen Einfluss auf den deutschen Wortvorrat des 18. Jahrhunderts (E. Erämetsä), 34-40.
 The Vocabulary of *Lust's Dominion* (G. Cross), 41-48.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. v, N.S. No. 2, Feb. 1958

Autobiographical Aspects of Wyatt's Verse, 48-52.
 Hamlet and the Arts, 52-53.
Tamburlaine and Gascoigne, 53-54.
 Cabalism in Renaissance England, 54-55.
 Annotated Volume from Pope's Library, 55-57.
The Phoenix, Raleigh, and King James, 57-61.
 A New Charles Churchill Letter, 61-63.
 Bacon and Feltham, 63-65.
 Comic Relief in *Venice Preserv'd*, 65-66.
 The Brietzcke Diary, 66-70.
 Wordsworth in the *Cambridge Bibliography*, 70-71.
 Lord Chesterfield and Jane Austen, 80-82.
 Another MS. Version of Tennyson's *To the Queen*, 82-83.
The Blithedale Romance as Theatre, 84-86.

Vol. v, N.S. No. 3, March 1958

Wordsworth's Wallachian Nightingales, 94-95.
 Spenser and General Election, 95.
The Unnatural Combat, 96.
 Marlowe Echo in Kyd, 96-97.
 Marlowe and Keats, 97-98.
 'The Foul Flibbertigibbet' [*King Lear*, III. iv. 113, IV. i. 60], 98-99.
 Chapman and Shakespeare, 99-100.
 Date of *The Devil's Law Case*, 100-1.
 John Pym, 101.
 Thorn-Drury's Notes on Thomas Stanley, 101-3.
 Vocabulary of Marston (XV), 103-4.

Medora Leigh, 105.
 Source of 'Fame is the spur', 106-7.
A Tale of a Tub and The Family of Love, 107-8.
 Marvell's Grasshoppers, 108-9.
 Marvell's Letters, 111.
The Vicar of Wakefield, 113-14.
 Coleridge at School, 114-16.
 Letter by Francis Jeffrey, 116-17.
 Samuel Richardson and Conrad, 119.
 Venice References in Pope, Eliot, and Lawrence, 119-20.
 The Brietzcke Diary, 120-1.
 A Holmes Letter, 121-2.
 Letter from Byron to John Hunt, 122-4.

Vol. v, N.S. No. 4, April 1958

Missing MSS. of Plumpton Letters, 140-1.
 Milton and Ecclesiastical Satire, 141-2.
 Browne's *Christian Morals*, 143.
 English Translation of Machiavelli's *Discourses*, 144-5.
 Barker to Grimm [Letter], 145-6.
 Tamburlaine's 'white . . . red . . . black . . . and Death [iv. i], 146-7.
 Kirkman's *The Wits*, 147-50.
 Unpublished Coleridge Sermon, 150-2.
 Letter of Garnett to Grimm, 152.
 Baroni in Disraeli's *Tancred*, 152.
 The Brietzcke Diary, 153-61.
 Testimonials from Matthew Arnold, 161-3.
 Theodore Hook, 163-4.
 Tennyson's Influence on Stephen Crane, 164-5.
 Aristophanes and Mark Twain, 165-8.
 A. S. Mathew, Blake and Flaxman, 168-78.
Comedy of Errors, II. ii. 57, 180.
Macflecknoe, 180.

Vol. v, N.S. No. 5, May 1958

Sir Robert Wiseman, 185.
 Ficino and Shakespeare, 185-6.
Wits Fittes and Shakespeare, 186-7.
Antony and Cleopatra, I. i. 42-43, 187-8.
 Fustian Answer to a Tuftaffeta Speech, 188-9.
 Hamlet's 'Coold mother', 189-90.
 The Dumb-Show Revisited, 191.
 The Riddle Song in *Merchant of Venice*, 191-3.
 'M.O.A.I.', 193.
 The Feast of Pride in *Troilus and Cressida*, 193-4.
 Milton and 'Dionysius Afer', 194-5.
 Milton and Poliziano, 195-6.
 Shakespeare's Learned Ladies, 197.
 Two Chaucer Allusions of 1659, 197-8.
 Thomas Watson and *Troilus and Cressida*, 198-9.
 Milton's 'Shook the Arsenal', 199-200.

Milton's 'worth ambition', 200.
 Milton's Syene and Meroe, 200-1.
 Date of *Samson Agonistes*, 201-2.
 Preposition 'Without' in *Paradise Lost*, 202-3.
 Milton's 'Night-founder'd', 203-4.
 Milton's 'Siloa's brook', 204-5.
 Milton's 'counsels different', 205.
 'Shade' for 'tree' in Milton, 205-8.
 Three Footnotes to Milton's Biography, 208.
Paradise Lost, II. 70-81, 208-9.
Paradise Lost, II. 257-62, XII. 561-69, 209-10.
 J. G. Cooper and Dodsley's *Museum*, 210-11.
 Pun in *Lycidas*, 211.
 Dryden's Bad Memory, 212-13.
 Old Testament Sainthood [the *Book of Homilies*], 213-14.
 Donne's Compass Image, 214-15.
 George Herbert's 'Jordan', 215.
 Library of John Smith, Cambridge Platonist, 215-16.
 Griffiths's *Monthly Review*, 216-17.
 Volpone's Song: a Source, 217-19.
 'Jambled', 219.
 Swift's Arithmetic, 219.
 Seventeenth-Century English Authors and Chancery, 219-20.
 Boswell in America, 220.
 Echoes in Pope, 220-1.
 Marston's Vocabulary (XV), 221-2.
 Collins's 'Springs', 222.
 John Hart, Orthographic Reformer, 222-4.
 Letter of Barker to Grimm, 224-5.
 Birthday Exercise by Matthew Arnold, 225.
 Original Version of Two Coleridge Couplets, 225-6.
Tristram Shandy and *Candide*, 226.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxvi, No. 4, Oct. 1957

Browning's Industrial Nightmare (D. V. Erdman), 417-35.
 Religious Implications in Browning's Poetry (J. E. Baker), 436-52.
 The Sources of Dryden's *The Mock Astrologer* (N. B. Allen), 453-64.
 Association of Ideas and Poetic Unity (R. Cohen), 465-74.
 Fielding's *The Masquerade* (L. P. Goggin), 475-87.
 The Authorship of *An Address to the Electors of Great Britain* (1740) (W. B. Coley), 488-95.
 An Identification in Keats's *Ode to Psyche* (G. Yost, Jr.), 496-500.
 Montaigne and Daniel's 'To Sir Thomas Egerton' (R. Himelick), 500-4.

Gulliver in Luggnagg: A Possible Source (J. L. Barroll), 504-8.
 Solomon Mendes, a Friend of Poets (A. Sherbo), 508-11.
 Gildon's *New Rehearsal* Again (M. Goldstein), 511-12.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xix, No. 2, Winter 1958

The Earliest State of the First Edition of Charles Dickens's *A Christmas Carol* (R. Gimbel), 82-86.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxxiii, No. 1, March 1958

Names of Scandinavians in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (I. Lehiste), 6-22.
 Political Allusions in Dryden's Later Plays (J. R. Moore), 36-42.
 Gulliver and the Struldbruggs (J. L. Barroll, III), 43-50.
 The Divided Tradition of English Criticism (W. A. Madden), 69-80.
 Wordsworth's Humor (J. E. Jordan), 81-93.
 Dickens's Archetypal Jew (L. Lane, Jr.), 94-100.
 James Examines Shakespeare (W. T. Stafford), 123-8.
 From *Finnegans Wake*: A Sentence in Progress (D. Hayman), 136-54.
 The Unity of Faulkner's *Light in August* (C. H. Holman), 155-66.
 Chaucer's Puns: A Supplementary List (P. F. Baum), 167-70.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURE MODERNE E COMPARATE

Anno X, N. 3-4, luglio-dicembre 1957

Donne in his Time: A Reading of *The Extasie* (A. J. Smith), 260-75.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxvi, No. 2, Spring 1958

Joseph Conrad (F. R. Leavis), 179-200.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

Vol. ix, No. 1, Winter 1958

Margaret of Anjou (T. H. McNeal), 1-10.

Daniel's *The Tragedie of Cleopatra and Antony and Cleopatra* (A. M. Z. Norman), 11-18.

Another Globe Theatre (R. Bernheimer), 19-29.

Did Shakespeare Use the Old Timon Comedy? (R. H. Goldsmith), 31-38.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lv, No. 1, Jan. 1958

The Evidence for Andreas Capellanus in

Re-Examination (J. F. Mahoney), 1-6.

The Elizabethan Minor Epic (P. W. Miller), 31-38.

The Authorship of *Lust's Dominion* (K. G. Cross), 39-61.

Lord Byron's Lakist Interlude (E. M. Everett), 62-75.

Was 'Negative Capability' Enough for Keats? (R. T. Davies), 76-85.

Dickens's Tragic Universe: *George Silverman's Explanation* (H. Stone), 86-97.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Vol. xxvii, No. 2, Jan. 1958

Belief and Disbelief (M. H. Abrams), 117-36.

Beowulf and the Harp at Sutton Hoo (J. B. Bessinger), 148-68.

Bernard Shaw: Imperfect Wagnerite (W. Blissett), 185-99.

Vol. xxvii, No. 3, April 1958

Milton in French Literature of the Nineteenth Century (F. Brinkley), 243-55.

VICTORIAN STUDIES

Vol. i, No. 3, March 1958

German Influence upon Scientific Instruction in England, 1867-87 (G. Haines, IV), 215-44.

The Neglect of Victorian Philosophy (A. Quinton), 245-54.

Browning, Emerson, and Bishop Blougram (C. E. Tanzy), 255-66.

From January 1958 the University of Colorado is publishing monthly *Abstracts of English Studies*. 'Scholarly, critical, and high quality general circulation magazines are included in an initial list of 100 from which abstracts will regularly be taken.'

and
n),
er),
on

in
t.
W.

on

M.

or

ge
e),

),

oo

V.

e-

-

G.

A.

-

f

e